

Apostolic Geography

The Origins and Continuity of a Hagiographic Habit

SCOTT FITZGERALD JOHNSON

The title of the present article takes its inspiration from an article by Jaś Elsner that appeared in the 1997 volume of the *Journal of Hellenic Studies*, “Hagiographic Geography: Travel and Allegory in the *Life of Apollonius of Tyana*.” There Elsner argues that Philostratus’s epochal *Life of Apollonius* (220s–30s CE) is more about the movement and travels of this famous figure than about Apollonius himself. For Elsner, answering the perennial question of just how accurate that *Life* really is, as a religious biography, is not essential to a proper reading of the work. Instead, what close analysis brings to the fore are constituent geographical qualities of the world now labeled “Greece under Rome,” despite the ostensible biographical focus.¹ In

Elsner’s words, the *Life of Apollonius* is not a collection of facts about the man but “a collection of places and personal experiences.”² In his view, the *Life* is a “metaphorical” and “experiential” journey that corresponds precisely to the expectations of the culture of the third century.³ Elsner goes on to make a number of further observations about the *Life*, in particular linking it with localized pilgrimage literature in the Second Sophistic east (Lucian, Aelius Aristides, Pausanias, etc.).⁴

Taking Elsner’s insistence on the value of travel for hagiographical narratives as a starting point, this article attempts to apply his approach to early Christian hagiographical texts, extending from the second century through late antiquity. However, I want to ask a slightly different question from Elsner’s and one that pertains to how the writers of late antique saints’ Lives received the world of classical literature (both Jewish and Greco-Roman) and made it their own. Namely, what is the underlying cartographic, or perhaps even cognitive, geography that frames and inspires early

✦ This article was originally commissioned as a paper for the “Landscapes of the Saints” colloquium held in the History Department at Princeton in March 2008. I would like to thank the organizers of that colloquium, Angie Gleason and Richard Payne, as well as the other participants who commented on my paper, particularly Catherine McKenna. An expanded version of the paper was also presented to a gracious and engaging audience at Washington and Lee University. I am grateful to Erik Ball, Kyle Harper, and Noel Lenski for their comments at various stages of the resulting article. Finally, I would like to thank Alice-Mary Talbot, Margaret Mullett, and the two anonymous reviewers for their many pertinent comments and corrections. Any remaining infelicities or errors are my own.

1 On this theme, see G. W. Bowersock, *Greek Sophists in the Roman Empire* (Oxford, 1969); S. Swain, *Hellenism and Empire: Language, Classicism, and Power in the Greek World, AD 50–250* (Oxford, 1996); S. Goldhill, ed., *Being Greek under Rome: Cultural*

Identity, the Second Sophistic, and the Development of Empire (Cambridge, 2001); T. Whitmarsh, *Greek Literature and the Roman Empire: The Politics of Imitation* (Oxford, 2001). [Note: All translations of ancient texts in this article are my own unless otherwise specified.]

2 J. Elsner, “Hagiographic Geography: Travel and Allegory in the *Life of Apollonius of Tyana*,” *JHS* 117 (1997): 22–37, at 22.

3 Ibid.

4 Ibid., 25.

Christian narrative fiction?⁵ Further, how do the experiential journeys, to use Elsner's phrase, of these apostles and saints employ or inform Christian literary assumptions and habits more generally in the late Roman period? A word I would like to introduce into the discussion is *archive*, because I think that saints' Lives and other related texts, such as pilgrimage narratives, can be profitably read as archives into which the authors deposit various shapes and sorts of preexistent material, not least the geographical data of the territories they are moving through.

These questions, of course, trade on certain definitions that it will be helpful to address at the beginning. *Saints*, in particular, is a nebulous category in early Christian and late antique realms. Anyone familiar with second-century literature, above all what have been termed "subliterary" texts, will see the wisdom of including the apostles in the category of saints, especially since the multifarious corpus of the Apocryphal Acts of the Apostles had a definitive impact on the early development of late antique saints' Lives.⁶ Moreover, Apocryphal Acta do not cease to be written at the advent of the *Life of Antony* in the fourth century. On the contrary, one could make the case that more surviving Apocryphal Acta were written *after* the *Life of Antony* (356–57 CE) than have survived from before it.⁷ What this fact underscores is that there was clearly much cross-pollination between various genres that we may like to include under the heading of hagiography. Thus the term *hagiography* itself has the poten-

tial to obscure rather than illuminate the structural continuities and discontinuities between these texts. Apocryphal Acta, martyrologies, saints' Lives, miracle collections, dialogues and disputes, eulogies, panegyrics, letters, pilgrimage narratives, collective biographies, and liturgical readings all at one time or another in this period deserve to be labeled "hagiography."⁸ Again, though convenient, the term tends to cloak the variety of this literature rather than encouraging literary scholars and historians to make use of that variety in their work.

With respect to the term *geography*, the present article runs the risk of abusing it by using it in its most abstract sense—not unlike other scholars' use of the terms *map* and *mapping* to signify mental states.⁹ "Apostolic geography" is the cartographic or cognitive basis that I argue underlies many late antique saints' Lives and other types of hagiographical literature.¹⁰ In particular, apostles and saints both claim certain regions of the known world, the *oikoumene*, in accepted patterns—patterns manipulated in a number of different ways to suit the needs of individual narratives. Nevertheless, geographical or cartographic thinking is a significant touchstone for Christian literature and offers a convenient point of access for the individual saints' relationships to local environments and even to the physical land in an agrarian or ecological model.

This article begins with late antique texts from the fourth and fifth centuries CE, in Greek and Latin. It then works backward into early Christian, classical Greco-Roman, and Hebrew literature, in an effort to demonstrate the long-term continuities in patterns of thought and writing. It closes by returning to late antiquity and offering some provisional conclusions about how to tie together the multifarious Christian

5 For a partial justification for applying the label *fiction* to ancient works, regardless of whether their truth claims can be corroborated, see P. Veyne, *Did the Greeks Believe in Their Myths? An Essay on the Constitutive Imagination*, trans. P. Wissing (Chicago, 1988), chap. 2.

6 Av. Cameron, *Christianity and the Rhetoric of Empire: The Development of Christian Discourse* (Berkeley, 1991), 89–119. Another way of thinking about these texts is as "the literature of consumption": see O. Pecere and A. Stramaglia, eds., *La letteratura di consumo nel mondo Greco-Latino: Atti del convegno internazionale, Cassino, 14–17 Settembre 1994* (Cassino, 1996). See also the debates over the terms *apocrypha* and *pseudepigrapha*: S. J. Shoemaker, "Early Christian Apocryphal Literature," in *The Oxford Handbook of Early Christian Studies*, ed. S. A. Harvey and D. G. Hunter (Oxford, 2008), 521–48; A. Y. Reed, "The Modern Invention of 'Old Testament Pseudepigrapha,'" *JTS* 60 (2009): 403–36.

7 S. F. Johnson, "Late Antique Narrative Fiction: Apocryphal Acta and the Greek Novel in the Fifth-Century *Life and Miracles of Thekla*," in *Greek Literature in Late Antiquity: Dynamism, Didacticism, Classicism* (Aldershot, 2006), 191–94.

8 For strategies of reading this literature as a whole, see S. F. Johnson, "Apocrypha and the Literary Past in Late Antiquity," in *From Rome to Constantinople: Studies in Honor of Averil Cameron*, ed. H. Amirav and B. ter Haar Romeny (Louvain, 2007), 47–66.

9 E.g., C. R. Whittaker, "Mental Maps: Seeing Like a Roman," in *Thinking Like a Lawyer: Essays on Legal History and General History for John Crook on His Eightieth Birthday*, ed. P. McKechnie (Leiden, 2002), 81–112; and J. Z. Smith, *Map Is Not Territory: Studies in the History of Religions* (Leiden, 1978).

10 The phrases "cognitive map" and "spatial knowledge" are used by B. Leyerle, "Landscape as Cartography in Early Christian Pilgrimage Narratives," *Journal of the American Academy of Religion* 64 (1996): 120.

literature that appears through this long period and in multiple languages.



In the pilgrimage narrative of the western matron Egeria (381–84 CE), a crucial section juxtaposes two apocryphal narratives related to apostles in the eastern Mediterranean.¹¹ This section comes near the end of the first half of her truncated text, as she is making her way back to Constantinople from Jerusalem. She tells of her visit to Edessa (mod. Urfa) in northern Mesopotamia, where lies (among other monuments) the shrine of Thomas. Later, she moves on to Seleukeia (mod. Silifke) in southern Asia Minor to visit the shrine of Thekla. In between, she stops to see the house of Abraham and the well of Rebecca in the pagan city of Haran (Roman Carrhae; mod. Harran). At all three sites, Egeria's first act of devotion is to go to the local church associated with the famous personality and read related texts in situ. For Abraham and Sarah in Haran, she reads selections from Genesis; but for Thomas and Thekla, she reads apocryphal legends about their apostolic travels, texts that she would have acquired or brought with her, in addition to the biblical codices she mentions elsewhere in the narrative.¹²

For Thekla the text she read on site is almost certainly the *Acts of Paul and Thekla*, which circulated widely in this period and was translated into every

early Christian language.¹³ For Thomas the text is less certain, as her account relates only that *aliquanta ipsius sancti Thomae ibi legimus*: in full, “Whence, continuing on further, we arrived in the name of Christ our God at Edessa. Where, when we had arrived, we proceeded immediately to the church and to the *martyrium* of Saint Thomas. Accordingly then, as is our custom, after prayers were said along with other things, which we customarily did at holy places, we did more and read there certain things of Saint Thomas himself.”¹⁴ It has been argued, on the basis of the active *legimus* rather than the passive verb she usually employed, that Egeria had a Latin translation of the *Acts of Thomas*, brought with her from home. This is certainly possible, but some have used this presumed Latin *Acts of Thomas* to argue for a late date for her pilgrimage (ca. 418), a date that could link her to the Priscillianist controversy.¹⁵ This latter argument has failed to win over her editors, and the 380s have remained the accepted date. Nevertheless, the *legimus* is interesting, especially taken together with the mention of reading on site as a usual habit (*consuetudo*), as well as the mention of the “deeds/writings” of Thomas. Most commentators have assumed that this evocative neuter plural, *aliquanta*, stands in for the early third-century *Acts of Thomas*, whether in Greek or Latin, in which Thomas evangelizes India.¹⁶ But if we take the genitive immediately following—*ipsius sancti Thomae*—to mean “by holy Thomas himself,” then the third-person *Acts* (as a whole) is not an option. Instead, it might be the second-century gnostic *Gospel of Thomas* (although that work is not about Thomas at all),¹⁷ the *Infancy Gospel of Thomas*, the *Book of Thomas the Contender*, or perhaps even the embedded “Hymn of the Pearl”—that is, the only part of the

11 On the dating of Egeria's text, see P. Maraval, ed., *Egérie, Journal de Voyage: Itinéraire*, rev. and corr. (Paris, 2002), 27–39. On pilgrimage in late antiquity, see E. D. Hunt, *Holy Land Pilgrimage in the Later Roman Empire, AD 312–460* (Oxford, 1982); P. Maraval, *Lieux saints et pèlerinages d'orient: Histoire et géographie des origines à la conquête arabe*, 2nd ed. (Paris, 2004); R. G. Ousterhout, ed., *The Blessings of Pilgrimage* (Urbana, IL, 1990); G. Frank, *The Memory of the Eyes: Pilgrims to Living Saints in Christian Late Antiquity* (Berkeley, 2000); eadem, “Pilgrimage,” in Harvey and Hunter, *Oxford Handbook* (n. 6 above), 826–41; A.-M. Talbot, “Female Pilgrimage in Late Antiquity and the Byzantine Era,” *Acta Byzantina Fennica*, n.s. 1 (2002): 73–88; B. Bitton-Ashkelony, *Encountering the Sacred: The Debate on Christian Pilgrimage in Late Antiquity* (Berkeley, 2005); M. Dietz, *Wandering Monks, Virgins, and Pilgrims: Ascetic Travel in the Mediterranean World, A.D. 300–800* (University Park, PA, 2005). See also the articles in *DOP* 56 (2002), which were presented at the symposium “Pilgrimage in the Byzantine Empire: 7th–15th Centuries”; note esp. P. Maraval, “The Earliest Phase of Christian Pilgrimage in the Near East (before the 7th Century),” *DOP* 56 (2002): 63–74.

12 E.g., Egeria 10.4.42 (ed. Maraval).

13 S. F. Johnson, *The Life and Miracles of Thekla: A Literary Study* (Washington, D.C., and Cambridge, MA, 2006), 1–14.

14 Egeria 19.2 (ed. Maraval): *Unde denuo proficiscens, pervenimus in nomine Christi Dei nostri Edessam. Ubi cum pervenissemus, statim perreximus ad ecclesiam et ad martyrium sancti Thomae. Itaque ergo iuxta consuetudinem factis orationibus et cetera, quae consuetudo erat fieri in locis sanctis, nec non etiam et aliquanta ipsius sancti Thomae ibi legimus.*

15 K. A. D. Smelik, “*Aliquanta ipsius Sancti Thomae*,” *VChr* 28 (1974): 290–94.

16 Maraval, *Egérie, Journal de Voyage*, 203–4 n. 6.

17 See Smelik, “*Aliquanta ipsius Sancti Thomae*,” 293.

Acts of Thomas which actually mentions Mesopotamia and which is written in the first person.¹⁸

In any of these cases, one important factor is that Egeria associates a specific text (or specific texts) with the shrine at Edessa, and reading a text on site seems to be one of her primary goals in visiting the shrine. This impression is reinforced at the end of her visit, when she obtains copies of the letters between Abgar and Jesus from the bishop who is escorting her around (19.19, ed. Maraval). She comments: "Even though I had copies of these in my homeland, nevertheless it seemed to me gracious that I should also receive there these copies from him, in case ours at home might prove deficient in some way. For this one which I received was clearly more complete [or 'larger/more full']. Whereupon, if our God Jesus should ordain it and I return home, you yourselves will read it, women of my spirit."¹⁹ This passage further solidifies our understanding of Egeria's archival process. She is a collector before setting out on the journey, and her prior activities motivate her pilgrimage. She continues her pattern and perhaps intensifies those activities while en route in the Holy Land, even up to the last stops on her return to Constantinople. Her fear that her personal copy of the Abgar letters in the west might be defective is also instructive in that she would prefer to take extra copies of a text *just in case* she might be missing crucial details. She also recognizes the vicissitudes of textual transmission. For Egeria, the more complete (*amplius*) the text, the better. While it might be tempting to criticize her credulity in trusting a clearly augmented legend at the very site of the events described, this temptation should be resisted. For Egeria and others like her, the closer to the physical source she can find a text, the better—and, significantly, she is more prone to distrust her own text, collected earlier and perhaps less complete, than the text of the bishop/tour guide trying to promote his city in the presence of a wealthy matron and her entourage.²⁰

18 See S. F. Johnson, "Reviving the Memory of the Apostles: Apocryphal Tradition and Travel Literature in Late Antiquity," in *Revival and Resurgence in Christian History*, ed. K. Cooper and J. Gregory, *Studies in Church History* 44 (Woodbridge, 2008), 18–19.

19 Egeria 19.19.105–9 (ed. Maraval): *Et licet in patria exemplaria ipsarum haberem, tamen gratius mihi visum est, ut et ibi eas de ipso acciperem, ne quid forsitan minus ad nos in patria pervenisset; nam vere amplius est, quod hic accepi. Unde si Deus noster Iesus iusserit et venero in patria, legitis vos, dominae animae meae.*

20 Note that Egeria does not appear to know the image of Christ

Rather than dismissing this mentality as simple credulity, I would prefer to understand it as a functional part of the cognitive landscape of late antique hagiographical texts, as well as an instructive example of how these texts circulated so widely during our period. As we will see, Egeria's mode of interacting with holy sites is not unique, and her approach seems to betoken an almost obsessive archiving instinct that disseminated Christian knowledge widely and rapidly.

We might compare with Egeria's account of her visit to Edessa her description of the Thekla shrine at Seleukeia: Egeria remarks that when they arrived at the shrine, *facta oratione ad martyrium nec non etiam et lecto omni actu sanctae Teclae*. The whole passage reads: "There, when I had arrived in the name of God, after my prayer was made at the shrine, and not only that, but also after the whole Act of Saint Thekla had been read, I gave unending thanks to Christ our God, who deemed me worthy to fulfill my desires in all ways, even while I was unworthy and not deserving."²¹ Here is the passive

(later, *mandylion*), a tradition associated with the *Doctrina Addai* and other texts: see G. E. Gingras, trans., *Egeria: Diary of a Pilgrimage* (New York, 1970), 206–7 nn. 215–16; and P. Devos, "Egerie à Édesse: S. Thomas l'apôtre, le roi Abgar," *AB* 85 (1967): 381–400. However, little noticed is her brief and ambiguous remark, *Ecce rex Aggarus, qui antequam videret Dominum, credidit ei, quia esset vere filius Dei* (19.6, ed. Maraval). This statement could be referring (obliquely) to the image of Christ sent to Abgar, or it could be a general statement recalling the ethos of doubting Thomas at John 20:29: "Jesus said to him, 'Have you believed because you have seen me? Blessed are those who have not seen and yet believe'" (RSV). The latter interpretation seems to me more plausible, given the absence of other mandylion references, and the resonance of John 20:29 additionally strengthens the association of the biblical Thomas with the site. On the mandylion tradition generally, see Av. Cameron, "The History of the Image of Edessa: The Telling of a Story," in *Okeanos: Essays Presented to Ihor Ševčenko*, ed. C. Mango and O. Pritsak, *Harvard Ukrainian Studies* 7 (Cambridge, MA, 1983), 80–94; H. L. Kessler and G. Wolf, eds., *The Holy Face and the Paradox of Representation: Papers from a Colloquium Held at the Bibliotheca Hertziana, Rome, and the Villa Spelman, Florence, 1996* (Bologna, 1998); G. Wolf, "La vedova di Re Abgar: Uno sguardo comparistico al Mandilion e alla Veronica," in *Les images dans les sociétés médiévales: Pour une histoire comparée*, ed. J.-M. Sansterre and J.-C. Schmitt (Brussels, 1999), 215–43; G. Morello and G. Wolf, eds., *Il volto di Cristo* (Milan, 2000); G. Wolf et al., eds., *Mandylion: Intorno al sacro volto, da Bisanzio a Genova* (Milan, 2004); and the recent collection of medieval Greek accounts by M. Guscini, *The Image of Edessa* (Leiden, 2009).

21 Egeria 23.5 (ed. Maraval): *Ibi ergo cum venissem in nomine Dei, facta oratione ad martyrium nec non etiam et lecto omni actu sanctae Teclae, gratias Christo Deo nostro egi infinitas, qui mihi dignatus est indignae et non merenti in omnibus desideria complere.*

construction mentioned above, but combined with a specific acknowledgment of the *actus* (in the singular), that is, very likely the second-century *Acts of (Paul and) Thekla* (as already noted). Gilbert Dagron has posited a library at Seleukeia where Egeria could have borrowed a copy of the *Acts*,²² but once her earlier visit to Edessa and the frequent mention of her portable biblical codex (or codices) are considered, it seems more likely that she brought the *Acts* with her, or at least obtained a copy in Jerusalem. In fact, the superior of the ascetic women at Seleukeia, Marthana, is named as a fellow pilgrim to Jerusalem (23.2.14, ed. Maraval), and we can reasonably presume that Marthana encouraged Egeria to pay her a visit on Egeria's homeward journey—perhaps she even provided Egeria with a personal copy.²³ This latter scenario may not be necessary, however, since we know from the visit to Edessa that Egeria enjoyed a collection of apocryphal texts at home in the west, and she may well have carried copies of both the Thomas text and the *Acts of Paul and Thekla* the whole way to Jerusalem and back. As for the language of the text, there is no reason to question that she was carrying a Latin translation, since we know that a Latin *Acts of Paul and Thekla* was circulating in the west by the third century; in any case, the scholarly consensus is that Egeria could not read Greek.²⁴ Both of these sites, Edessa and Seleukeia, were off the beaten track for Holy Land pilgrims in the fourth century (and still are today), and both are apocryphal or extracanonical sites. Both visits to the local shrines were made in the context of a preexistent mental geography, and the texts that Egeria uses at both sites seem to motivate her visits.²⁵ Perhaps this is a somewhat

rare example of west influencing east in late antiquity, given that the hagiographic or charismatic geography of the relics of martyrs and saints was already current in Rome and Milan, as evidenced particularly by the actions of the bishops Damasus and Ambrose.²⁶

What more can we say about the cartographic element of these visits? Recently, scholars of Roman cartography have drawn attention to the textual nature of Roman, especially late Roman, maps and, vice versa, the cartographical nature of ancient travel narratives. Both the texts and the maps are linked to classical *periploi* and *itineraria*, works in Greek and Latin that can be as rich and harrowing as Hanno the Carthaginian's circumnavigation of Africa in the sixth century BCE or as apparently routine as the tabular *Antonine Itinerary* from the high empire.²⁷ In the midst of this varied literary history stand the few extant maps from the ancient world, such as the famous Peutinger Table, thought to be a twelfth-century copy of a (probably) fourth-century CE map.²⁸ These maps resemble nothing at all in modern cartography. Instead, they appear to be route maps, representing preexistent *itineraria* and *periploi* on paper. The adjective often used to describe these maps is *hodological* (from ἡ ὁδός, "route, way"), in that

22 G. Dagron, ed., *Vie et Miracles de Sainte Thècle: Texte grec, traduction et commentaire* (Brussels, 1978), 33.

23 A "Marthana" is also mentioned in passing in the 5th-century *Miracles of Thekla* 44.43 (ed. Dagron, *Vie et Miracles*, 406–7).

24 E.g., Gingras, *Egeria: Diary of a Pilgrimage*, 44. For the Latin version of the *Acts of Paul and Thekla*, see Johnson, *Life and Miracles of Thekla*, 3, and K. Cooper, "A Saint in Exile: The Early Medieval Thekla at Rome and Meriamlik," *Hagiographica* 2 (1995): 1–23.

25 There are, of course, "performances" in her response that deserve to be noted in addition to her assumptions: (1) Egeria reveals herself as a keen observer of liturgy and may be trying to extemporize on the liturgies she witnesses in Jerusalem; (2) she imitates the saint by following in his or her literal footsteps (this is the hagiographical quality of Egeria); and (3) Egeria's late antique readers, her *sorores* (as she calls them), are "surrogate pilgrims" following in her path as they read her text. On surrogate pilgrimage, see Elsner, "Hagiographic Geography" (n. 2 above) 28; on Egeria's audience, see H. S. Sivan,

"Holy Land Pilgrimage and Western Audiences: Some Reflections on Egeria and Her Circle," *CQ*, n.s. 38 (1988): 528–35.

26 See references in J. Elsner and I. Rutherford, eds., *Pilgrimage in Greco-Roman and Early Christian Antiquity: Seeing the Gods* (Oxford, 2005), 29 n. 128. Note particularly M. Sághy, "Scinditur in partes populus: Pope Damasus and the Martyrs of Rome," *Early Medieval Europe* 9 (2000): 273–87.

27 O. A. W. Dilke, *Greek and Roman Maps* (Baltimore, 1998); C. Adams and R. Laurence, eds., *Travel and Geography in the Roman Empire* (London, 2001); L. Ellis and F. Kidner, eds., *Travel, Communication, and Geography in Late Antiquity: Sacred and Profane* (Aldershot, 2004); B. Salway, "The Perception and Description of Space in Roman Itineraries," in *Wahrnehmung und Erfassung geographischer Räume in der Antike*, ed. M. Rathmann (Mainz am Rhein, 2007), 181–209.

28 B. Salway, "The Nature and Genesis of the Peutinger Map," *Imago Mundi* 57 (2005): 119–35; E. Albu, "Imperial Geography and the Medieval Peutinger Map," *Imago Mundi* 57 (2005): 136–48 (dating the Peutinger Table to the Carolingian period); R. Talbert, "Peutinger's Roman Map: The Physical Landscape Framework," in *Wahrnehmung und Erfassung geographischer Räume in der Antike*, ed. Rathmann, 220–30. Note also the recently discovered map of the Iberian peninsula, ostensibly from the time of Artemidorus of Ephesus (ca. 100 BC): see C. Gallazzi et al., eds., *Il papiro di Artemidoro (P. Artemid.)* (Milan, 2008), and L. Canfora, ed., *Il papiro di Artemidoro* (Bari, 2008).

they have the internal logic of a linear route and not a third-party or omniscient view.²⁹ One scholar has with some justice compared the Peutinger Table to the London Tube map, since neither corresponds directly to overland reality: more important to both are the relative distances between stops and the internal logic of the map.³⁰

Egeria's text and especially that of the Bordeaux Pilgrim (333 CE) have been linked to the *itinerarium* genre.³¹ By extension, it may be profitable to attempt to work out the cartographic logic of Egeria's text. Egeria moves toward a goal but often stops to zigzag across her previous path—as is especially apparent in her visit to Sinai—leaving her readers with only a hodological sense of real space (1–3, ed. Maraval).³² It would be impossible to determine the proportional distances between places in her narrative without a modern map, or without at least prior experience of the terrain. With regard to Edessa and Seleukeia, the reader is left with the sense that in their spheres of influence, these two saints abut one another's territory. This is the literary effect. We may hesitate to think of Egeria in hodological terms, but that is the background of her genre. What she has added, or assumed, is the apostolic overlay, which is more prominent in this section of her account than are the waypoints.³³ She passes through apostolic spheres of influence that take on three-dimensional shapes

even though the canvas they are drawn on is decidedly two-dimensional.

Egeria is not the only writer in late antiquity to have thought about geography, landscape, and space in this way. The author of the fifth-century *Life and Miracles of Thekla* speaks about Thekla “owning” Seleukeia and its environs (*Life* 27–28; *Mir.* passim). Thekla acquired this region not because Paul sent her there: in fact, in the *Acts of Paul and Thekla*, Paul sent her back to her hometown of Iconium, and she herself chose to go on to Seleukeia, where she spent the rest of her life and finally died at age ninety. However, the fifth-century text significantly changes this tradition and has her disappearing into the ground, explicitly not dying, and claiming the earth around Seleukeia as her own. Thereafter she indefinitely haunts the area and works miracles for locals and pilgrims alike:

After she had proclaimed the saving word of the gospel, and had catechized, sealed [i.e., baptized], and enrolled many in the army of Christ, she performed many more wonders even than this—just as Peter in Antioch and in the greatest Rome, Paul in Athens and among all the nations, John the greatest theologian in Ephesus—and through these miracles especially she led all people to the faith. Then did she die? According to the widespread and most authentic tradition, absolutely not! She went down alive and entered under the earth; thus God had decided to divide and rend asunder for her that very earth, upon which spot the divine and holy and celebratory table is fixed, being set in a peristyle and a shining silver circle[.]³⁴

After Thekla's disappearance into the ground, the anonymous author of this text makes it clear that her

29 This approach is usually held to have originated with P. Janni, *La mappa e il periplo: Cartografia antica e spazio odologico* (Rome, 1984).

30 K. Brodersen, *Terra Cognita: Studien zur römischen Raumerfassung* (Hildesheim, 1995), 59–68; see also R. Talbert and K. Brodersen, eds., *Space in the Roman World: Its Perception and Presentation* (Münster, 2004).

31 J. Elsner, “The *Itinerarium Burdigalense*: Politics and Salvation in the Geography of Constantine's Empire,” *JRS* 90 (2000): 181–95.

32 This effect is not absent from some earlier geographical writers, Pausanias in particular: see A. M. Snodgrass, *An Archaeology of Greece: The Present State and Future Scope of a Discipline* (Berkeley, 1987), 75–89.

33 The apostolic overlay coexists with the overlay of the late Roman provincial system, which perhaps has more direct relevance for the Bordeaux Pilgrim. See Elsner, “*Itinerarium Burdigalense*”; and R. Talbert, “Rome's Provinces as Framework for World-View,” in *Roman Rule and Civic Life: Local and Regional Perspectives*, ed. L. de Ligt, E. A. Hemelrijk, and H. Singor (Amsterdam, 2004), 21–37. In light of the discussion below, it is worth noting here that provincial gubernatorial posts in late antiquity were chosen by lot: see A. H. M. Jones, *The Later Roman Empire, 284–602: A Social, Economic, and Administrative Survey* (Oxford, 1964), 107.

34 *Life* 28.1–11 (ed. Dagron): Εὐαγγελισαμένη δὲ τὸν σωτήριον λόγον, καὶ πολλοὺς μὲν κατηχήσασα καὶ σφραγισαμένη καὶ στρατολογήσασα τῷ Χριστῷ, πολλῶ δ' αὐτῇ πλεῖον θαυματουργήσασα—ὡς Πέτρος ἐν Ἀντιοχείᾳ καὶ τῇ μεγίστῃ Ῥώμῃ, Παῦλος ἐν Ἀθήναις καὶ τοῖς ἔθνεσι πᾶσιν, Ἰωάννης ὁ μέγιστος θεολόγος ἐν Ἐφέσῳ—, καὶ διὰ τῶν θαυμάτων μάλιστα πάντας ἐναγαγούσα πρὸς τὴν πίστιν, ἐκοιμήθη μὲν, ὡς ὁ πολὺς καὶ ἀληθέστερος λόγος, οὐδαμῶς, ἔδω δὲ ζῶσα καὶ ὑπεισῆλθε τὴν γῆν, οὕτω τῷ Θεῷ δόξαν, διαστήναι τε αὐτῇ καὶ ὑπορραγῆναι τὴν γῆν ἐκείνην, ἐν ᾧ περ τόπων ἢ θεία καὶ ἱερὰ καὶ λειτουργικὴ πέπηγε τράπεζα, ἐν περιστύλῳ καὶ ἀργυροφεγγεῖ καθιδρυμένη κύκλῳ[.]

area of influence extends north across the mountains to Iconium and east-southeast to Tarsus, Paul's birthplace, where every year the festival in honor of Paul competes with the festival in honor of Thekla. The juxtaposition of these apostles' personal spheres produces a friendly rivalry between the cities in the later fifth century, according to the text (*Life* 27.39–44, ed. Dagon). To justify this picture of Thekla as rooted, physically and notionally (in the sense that she is competing with Paul himself), the author of the *Life and Miracles* deftly combines the ancient, second-century tradition and the new Thekla as healing-cult figure. He includes as the first half of his text a metaphrastic version of the original *Acts of Paul and Thekla* and combines it in the second half with a collection of forty-six miracles he compiled himself.

I will consider the possible origins of Thekla's mysterious disappearance in a moment. For now, it is enough to point out what appears to be a crucial parallel between the *Life and Miracles* and Egeria's journal: in both cases received, early Christian, apostolic texts seem to underlie, or even to motivate, the geographical understanding of the late antique authors. While it is no doubt true that an established cult is in place prior to the writing of both of these "Seleukeian" texts—Egeria's visit and the *Life and Miracles*—both Egeria and the anonymous author of the *Life and Miracles* act as archivists while attempting to connect text and landscape in situ.³⁵ For these authors, orienting themselves in this landscape of saints is identical to collecting texts about the landscape, both ancient and contemporary, and incorporating them into their own hybrid compositions.



For those interested in the origins of this phenomenon—that is, the transformation of landscape into archive—there are plenty of ancient parallels to be found. On the encyclopedic side, we are reminded of the possible narrative incorporation of Agrippa's map

35 L. W. Farnell, *Greek Hero Cults and Ideas of Immortality* (Oxford, 1921), 299: "Again and again the students of mythology have to be reminded that there is no single key. Some myths have been well and convincingly explained as arising out of ritual; it is equally true that some ritual has arisen out of myth, that is, out of some divine or human incident believed to be true, of which the ritual was an expression."

into Strabo and Pliny the Elder.³⁶ In both of those cases a preexistent geographical framework motivates the archival project. Both authors proceed around the Mediterranean in a precise order, following the map of Roman conquest set up in Rome under Augustus. The evolution of this genre also recalls the compilatory paradoxographical texts associated with the name of Aristotle. These are Hellenistic and Roman collections of natural wonders from around the oikoumene, and beyond.³⁷ The "Aristotelian" ones are pseudonymous, but we know that the name Aristotle was associated by later paradoxographers with the founding of the genre.³⁸ This is the gray area between "real science"—in this case, natural and geographical classification—and pseudo-science aping scientific genres and their founding personalities. Here, in my opinion, it is only a short step to Christian hagiographical literature and the presumption of a foundational apostolic geography.³⁹ To return to the *Life of Apollonius of Tyana*, the collection of *thaumata* (wonders) from exotic and marginal places in the high Roman Empire is as significant in that text as it is in the late antique *Life of Antony*, the *Miracles of Thekla* (ca. 470), or John Moschus's *Pratum Spirituale* (ca. 600), which I will discuss at the end.⁴⁰ Both the collection of wonders and the classification of the world into regions—regions based not on political realities but on spheres of cultic or hagiographical influence—are two fundamental cognitive trends from the Hellenistic world that were absorbed into the fabric

36 Dilke, *Greek and Roman Maps* (n. 27 above), 41–53; K. Clarke, *Between Geography and History: Hellenistic Constructions of the Roman World* (Oxford, 1999), 8–9; T. M. Murphy, *Pliny the Elder's Natural History: The Empire in the Encyclopedia* (Oxford, 2004); S. Carey, *Pliny's Catalogue of Culture: Art and Empire in the Natural History* (Oxford, 2003).

37 A. Giannini, ed., *Paradoxographorum Graecorum Reliquiae* (Milan, 1966).

38 See G. Schepens and K. Delcroix, "Ancient Paradoxography: Origin, Evolution, Production, and Reception," in Pecere and Stramaglia, *Letteratura* (n. 6 above), 375–460.

39 Herodotus's book 2, the "Egyptian *Logos*," is also associated with this genre and was imitated by early Christian miracle collectors: see Johnson, *Life and Miracles of Thekla* (n. 13 above), chaps. 3, 4.

40 Elsner, "Hagiographic Geography" (n. 2 above), 23. Compare what Elsner calls elsewhere "thomatistic excess," from Herodotus's *θώματα* (Att. *θαύματα*): J. Elsner, "From the Pyramids to Pausanias and Piglet: Monuments, Travel, and Writing," in *Art and Text in Ancient Greek Culture*, ed. S. Goldhill and R. Osborne (Cambridge, 1994), 235.

of late antique Christian literature. Given this larger frame of reference, it is no surprise that Roman cartography and cartographical literature were received as a model for pilgrimage narratives in the fourth century.

If we look more closely at specific classical texts, even the modes of expression are similar to the ways that Christian texts talk about saints and geography. In particular, there are numerous scenes in which gods or heroes will take possession of a region upon their death or disappearance. As in Christian texts, there is usually a cult in existence on the site that predates the scene described. One of the most prominent is the disappearance of Oedipus at the end of Sophocles' *Oedipus at Colonus*. He disappears into the ground at a sacred grove in the Colonus deme of Athens as his daughters, Antigone and Ismene, look on.⁴¹ The site, well known to the Athenian audience, was sacred to the Furies—that is, the Eumenides or Erinyes—chthonic deities who were responsible for the retribution of blood guilt, particularly among families. Ismene says of her father at the end of the play, “He descended without burial, apart from everyone.”⁴² Theseus responds to Ismene and Antigone in a reassuring tone:

Stop your mourning, girls! For, among those for whom
the night underground is laid up as a gift,
it is not necessary to lament them; that is
deserving of divine wrath!⁴³

41 Sophocles himself was from the Colonus deme (*OC* 707–19, in *Sophocles Fabulae*, ed. H. Lloyd-Jones and N. G. Wilson [Oxford and New York, 1990]). Not insignificantly, Sophocles died in 406 and *Oedipus at Colonus* was produced posthumously in 401 by his grandson, also named Sophocles. Further, the elder Sophocles was the only tragedian to be honored by a hero cult after his death, though with a new name, Dexion (“the Receiver”), presumably connected to Sophocles’ “reception” of the cult of Asclepius to Athens and even into his own home. Thus, the ending of the play *Oedipus at Colonus* probably carries resonance of the author’s subsequent chthonic identity, via the mysterious disappearance of Oedipus at Sophocles’ home deme. See the discussion and bibliography in A. Markantonatos, *Oedipus at Colonus: Sophocles, Athens, and the World* (Berlin, 2007), 10–19.

42 *OC* 1732 (ed. Lloyd-Jones and Wilson): ἀταφος ἐπιτνε δίχα τε παντός. Cf. Pausanias 1.28.6, 1.30.4.

43 *OC* 1751–53 (ed. Lloyd-Jones and Wilson): παύετε θρήνον, παῖδες· ἐν οἷς γὰρ / χάρις ἢ χθονία νύξ ἀπόκειται, / πενθεῖν οὐ χρή· νέμεσις γάρ. See also *OC* 1760–67: [θῆ.] ὦ παῖδες, ἀπείπεν ἐμοὶ κείνος / μήτε πελάζειν ἐς τοῦσδε τόπους / μήτ’ ἐπιφωεῖν μηδὲνα θνητῶν /

This scene could be read as foundational for later thinking on the disappearance of holy figures blessed by the gods with a good death. However, this is not Elijah ascending into the heavens in a fiery chariot; instead, these heroes descend into the earth and continue to haunt the locality and be worshipped there.

Another Greek example comes from Pausanias, the travel writer and pilgrim of the late second century CE (his *Description of Greece* was finished ca. 180). He describes the disappearance of the boxer Kleomedes of Astypalaia and his subsequent worship:

In the previous Olympic games they say Kleomedes of Astypalaia, while boxing with a man named Hikkos of Epidauros, killed Hikkos in the fight; being condemned by the Greek arbiters for having acted unjustly and being deprived of the victory, he went out of his mind from the grief. He went back to Astypalaia and, attacking a school there where there were as many as sixty boys, he overturned the pillar that was holding up the roof. When the roof fell in on the boys, he was stoned by the people and he fled for refuge in Athena’s sanctuary. He climbed inside a chest that was kept in the sanctuary and pulled down the lid. The Astypalaians labored with useless toil to open it; in the end they broke through the wooden walls of the chest, but they did not find Kleomedes, either alive or dead. So they sent men to Delphi in order to ask what sort of things had befallen Kleomedes. They say the Pythian priestess returned this oracle:

Astypalaian Kleomedes is the last of the heroes, he whom you should worship with sacrifices, since he is no longer mortal.

From that time forward the Astypalaians paid honors to Kleomedes as a [divine] hero.⁴⁴

θήκην ἱερὰν ἣν κείνος ἔχει. / Καὶ ταῦτά μ’ ἔφη πρᾶσσοντα καλῶς / χώραν ἔξειν αἰὲν ἄλυπον. / Ταῦτ’ οὖν ἐκλυεν δαίμων ἡμῶν / χῶ πάντ’ αἰὼν Διὸς Ὀρκος. On which, note F. Budelmann, *The Language of Sophocles: Communitality, Communication, and Involvement* (Cambridge, 2000), 42: “One effect, I suggest, of the repeated *keinos* in particular and the relative clause in general is to hint at Oedipus’ changed role after death.”

44 Pausanias 6.9.6–8 (*Graeciae descriptio*, ed. F. Spiro [Stuttgart,

Both Kleomedes and Oedipus are explicitly covered over, Kleomedes in a box and Oedipus in the earth. Both heroes have led tragic lives and are outcasts from society.⁴⁵ For both, their disappearance is interpreted with oracular pronouncements. And, significantly, both disappear in a preexistent sanctuary—of the Eumenides and Athena, respectively—and add their own sanctity and cult to the site.⁴⁶ On this latter point, the doubling of worship is not unusual in the Greek world and obviously is also found in Christian cult.⁴⁷ Not only do late antique Christian cults reuse the

sacred space of their pagan or polytheistic predecessors but they reuse that of their Jewish and early Christian forebears as well.⁴⁸ Real continuity is achieved not just through the adoption of pagan sites for Christian churches—a complex but expected phenomenon, which ends in replacement rather than doubling—but also through the very modes of appropriation or reappropriation previously used by the pagans; the latter is perhaps a more subtle and surprising effect, which is almost certainly tied to literary resonance. In other words, while Christian writers often simply replace pagan cults with Christian ones, they nevertheless incorporate their own earlier Christian cults very much as Greco-Roman authors reincorporated earlier pagan cults of their own.



This doubling of holy figures at the same site is a key factor in the emergent association of Christian saints with specific places, and it reinforces the idea that Greco-Roman and early Christian writers shared patterns of thought about geography. Mount Sion in Jerusalem is a significant example of Christian doubling in the Holy Land, with multiple associations both Jewish and Christian (and both canonical and apocryphal): the Bordeaux Pilgrim mentions the remains there of Solomon's temple (including the pinnacle on top of which Jesus was tempted by Satan), Hezekiah's palace, the martyrdom site of Zechariah the prophet, the house of Caiaphas, and the column at which Christ was scourged.⁴⁹

48 One interesting characteristic of the literary side of this phenomenon of reuse is the presence of an increasingly figurative, metaphorical, or rhetorical quality at each subsequent remove. A late antique example is the completely rhetorical reuse of Sarpedon and his local cult in the *Miracles of Thekla* 1 (ed. Dagron), a cult that was likely defunct by then: "No one is ignorant of this Sarpedonian [Apollo], for most ancient is the legend about him that we learned from histories and books" (Τὸν Σαρπηδόνιον τοῦτον ἀγνοεῖ μὲν οὐδεὶς, καὶ γὰρ παλαιότατον τὸ κατ' αὐτὸν μυθολόγημα ἐγνωμεν ἀπὸ ἱστοριῶν καὶ βιβλίων). Thekla goes on to seize his (ostensibly functioning) *temenos* and silence the oracle associated with it. On the figurative usage of topography, consider the statement in Leyerle, "Landscape as Cartography" (n. 10 above), 130 (referring to Jerome): "Scripture continues to make place meaningful; but place, in turn, now functions to extend scripture with vistas of deeper spiritual insight."

49 P. Geyer, O. Cuntz, et al., eds., *Itineraria et Alia Geographica*,

1903)): τῇ δὲ Ὀλυμπίᾳ δι τῇ πρὸ ταύτης Κλεομήδην φασὶν Ἀστυπαλαίᾳ ὡς Ἴκκῳ πυκτεύων ἀνδρὶ Ἐπιδαυρίῳ τὸν Ἴκκον ἀποκτείνειεν ἐν τῇ μάχῃ, καταγνώσθεις δὲ ὑπὸ τῶν Ἑλλανοδικῶν ἄδικα εἰργάσθαι καὶ ἀφρημένους τὴν νίκην ἐκφρων ἐγένετο ὑπὸ τῆς λύπης καὶ ἀνέστρεψε μὲν ἐς Ἀστυπάλαιαν, διδασκαλείῳ δ' ἐπιστὰς ἐνταῦθα ὅσον ἐξήκοντα ἀριθμὸν παιδῶν ἀνατρέπει τὸν κίονα ὃς τὸν ὄροφον ἀνείχεν. ἐμπεσόντος δὲ τοῦ ὀρόφου τοῖς παισὶ, καταλιθούμενος ὑπὸ τῶν ἀστῶν κατέφυγεν ἐς Ἀθηνᾶς ἱερόν· ἐσβάντος δὲ ἐς κιβωτὸν κειμένην ἐν τῷ ἱερῷ καὶ ἐφέλκυσσάμενος τὸ ἐπιθήμα, κάματον ἐς ἀνωφελὲς οἱ Ἀστυπαλαίῃς ἔκαμνον ἀνοίγειν τὴν κιβωτὸν πειρώμενοι· τέλος δὲ τὰ ξύλα τῆς κιβωτοῦ καταρρήξαντες, ὡς οὔτε ζῶντα Κλεομήδην οὔτε τεθνεῶτα εὕρισκον, ἀποστέλλουσιν ἄνδρας ἐς Δελφοὺς ἐρησομένους ὅποια ἐς Κλεομήδην τὰ συμβάντα ἦν. τούτοις χρῆσαι τὴν Πυθίαν φασίν.

ὑστατος ἡρώων Κλεομήδης Ἀστυπαλαίεύς,
ὃν θυσίαις τιμᾶ<θ' ᾗ> τε μηκέτι θνητὸν ἔόντα.

Κλεομήδει μὲν οὖν Ἀστυπαλαίῃς ἀπὸ τούτου τιμὰς ὡς ἥρωι νέμουσι.

45 J. Fontenrose, "The Hero as Athlete," *California Studies in Classical Antiquity* 1 (1968): 73–104; C. M. Antonaccio, "Contesting the Past: Hero Cult, Tomb Cult, and Epic in Early Greece," *AJA* 98 (1994): 389–410.

46 One might compare here the *in statu nascendi* quality of Ajax's cult in Sophocles; see A. Henrichs, "The Tomb of Aias and the Prospect of Hero Cult in Sophocles," *Classical Antiquity* 12 (1993): 165–80; note particularly the usage of κατέχει with reference to how Ajax "possesses" his tomb (171–73). See also Farnell, *Greek Hero Cults* (n. 35 above), chap. 9, esp. 281: "All the hero-cults are chthonian, with a ritual only appropriate to a buried spirit." See also the somewhat moderated view of W. Burkert, *Greek Religion: Archaic and Classical*, trans. J. Raffan (Cambridge, MA, 1985), 206: "An important difference between the hero cult and the cult of the gods is that a hero is always confined to a specific locality: he acts in the vicinity of his grave for his family, group, or city." Finally, see A. D. Nock's classic treatment of the blurry distinction between gods and heroes in Greek religion, "The Cult of Heroes," *Harvard Theological Review* 37 (1944): 141–66, esp. 144–48.

47 On the relation between hero cult and early Christianity generally, see the stimulating papers in *Philostratus' Heroikos: Religion and Cultural Identity in the Third Century CE*, ed. E. B. Aitken and J. K. B. Maclean (Leiden, 2004).

Zechariah's association with the Temple Mount shows a special kind of reuse, particularly because multiple texts record various "Zechariahs" at precisely this site: (1) Zechariah the prophet, the son of Barachiah, titular author of the book of Zechariah in the Hebrew Bible; (2) Zechariah, son of Jehoiada, who prophesied against Joash and was stoned "in the court of the house of the Lord" (2 Chronicles 24:20–22); and, finally, (3) Zechariah, the father of John the Baptist (Luke 1).⁵⁰ The first two were already identified as one and the same Zechariah by the time of Matthew 23:35, a conflation which Egeria perpetuates, claiming (with Matthew) that Zechariah the son of Barachiah was martyred.⁵¹ However, an important early Christian apocryphon, the second-century *Protoevangelion of James*, offers an even more fascinating conflation, or doubling, of Zechariahs and the Temple Mount, and one that connects closely to the disappearance tradition discussed above.

The *Protoevangelion of James* deals mainly with the birth and infancy of the Virgin Mary, and consequently was very popular in the fifth century and later, once personal devotion to Mary really began to gather steam.⁵² The Zechariah scene comes at the very end: Zechariah is murdered in the temple at the hands of Herod's men, who are searching for the infant John. Zechariah before his death alludes to both 2 Chronicles 24 and Matthew 23, producing a triple conflation of the three biblical Zechariahs. Furthermore, fleeing Herod's men, Elizabeth and the baby John escape Jerusalem, seek refuge on a mountain, and end up disappearing into it:

But Elizabeth, when she heard that John was sought after, took him and went up into the hill country. And she looked around [to see] where she could hide him, and there was no hiding place. Then groaning aloud Elizabeth said: "O mountain of God, receive me, a mother, with my child." For Elizabeth was unable to go up [further] for fear. And immediately the mountain was rent asunder and it received her. And that mountain was a shining light for her, for an angel of the Lord was with them in order to protect them.⁵³

Thus, in the second-century *Protoevangelion of James* we see a number of elements from this long tradition of associating famous individuals, usually known through accepted texts, with local places. There is the conflation of Zechariahs, bridging three different texts written centuries apart—a conflation that has an archival air and is linked to a specific area on the Temple Mount. This site was apparently revered as the place of (at least one) Zechariah's martyrdom prior to the *Protoevangelion* itself and was still known in Egeria's day in the late fourth century.⁵⁴ There is also the motif of the holy figure disappearing into the ground, which we have seen in the Oedipus tradition, in the story of Kleomedes from Pausanias, and in Thekla's fifth-century *Life and Miracles*.⁵⁵ However, we are missing

2 vols., CCSL 175–76 (Turnhout, 1965), 1:590–92. Andrew Jacobs describes the numerous figures associated with the temple as "scriptural ghosts": see his discussion of this site in A. S. Jacobs, *Remains of the Jews: The Holy Land and Christian Empire in Late Antiquity* (Stanford, 2004), 112–15.

50 J. Wilkinson, *Egeria's Travels*, 3rd ed. (Warminster, 1999), 88 n. 9. On the many Zechariah stories that survive, touching on all three biblical characters, see A. Berendts, *Studien über Zacharias-Apokryphen und Zacharias-Legenden* (Leipzig, 1895).

51 The reference to "Zechariah" comes at the beginning of Peter the Deacon's *De locis sanctis* (1137 CE), a partial summary of Egeria's narrative, and is likely drawn from Egeria's own (lost) description of the "Holy Sion" church (Geyer and Cuntz, 1:96, sec. E). See also Bede's summary, incorporated verbatim into Peter's work (*ibid.*, 95, sec. C.3.33–35), which notes the same conflation just prior to the section that appears to come from Egeria.

52 S. J. Shoemaker, *Ancient Traditions of the Virgin Mary's Dormition and Assumption* (Oxford, 2002).

53 *Prot. Jacobi* 43–44 (ed. É. de Strycker, *La forme la plus ancienne du Protévangile de Jacques* [Brussels, 1961]): 'Η δὲ Ἐλισάβετ ἀκούσασα ὅτι Ἰωάννης ζητεῖται, λαβομένη αὐτὸν ἀνέβη ἐν τῇ ὄρεινῃ· καὶ περιεβλέπετο ποῦ αὐτὸν ἀποκρύψει, καὶ οὐκ ἐνί τόπος ἀπόκρυφος. Τότε στενάξασα Ἐλισάβετ λέγει· Ὁρος Θεοῦ, δέξαι με μητέρα μετὰ τέκνου. Οὐ γὰρ ἐδύνατο ἡ Ἐλισάβετ ἀναβῆναι διὰ τὴν δειλίαν. Καὶ παραχρῆμα ἐδιχάσθη τὸ ὄρος καὶ ἐδέξατο αὐτήν. Καὶ ἦν τὸ ὄρος ἐκεῖνο διαφαίνον αὐτῇ φῶς· ἄγγελος γὰρ Κυρίου ἦν μετ' αὐτῶν ὁ διαφυλάσσων αὐτούς.

54 Half a century later Sozomen records (*HE* 9.17) that the relics of the prophet Zechariah, son of Jehoida, were discovered near Eleutheropolis in Palestine. Lying buried at the prophet's feet was the young son of Joash, king of Judah. The identification was made via an apocryphal Hebrew text discovered by Zechariah (!), the *hegoumenos* of a nearby monastery. The text claimed that Joash buried his son there as penance for the murder of Zechariah (cf. 2 Chron. 24:20–22). Note especially the remarkable absence of conflation in Sozomen's account between Zechariah son of Jehoida and Zechariah son of Barachiah.

55 It is worth noting that Greek heroes, despite their similarities to Christian saints, were not always holy figures in a moral sense (e.g., Kleomedes above); see Burkert, *Greek Religion*, 207–8: "The

Origen reports in volume 3 of his *Commentaries on Genesis*.⁵⁹

This notice contradicts the earlier tradition, represented in the *Acts of Thomas*, that Thomas was the apostle to India.⁶⁰ We would expect Eusebius to know better, as he claims he obtained his copy of the Abgar legend from the Syriac original in the Edessa archive (*HE* 1.13.5, ed. Bardy 2001). Presumably he also knew the *Acts of Thomas*—at the least, we can say he knows a tradition in which Thomas sends Thaddeus to Edessa (as “one of the seventy,” *HE* 1.13.4; cf. Luke 10:1).⁶¹ However,

59 *HE* 3.1 (*Eusèbe de Césarée: Histoire Ecclésiastique*, ed. G. Bardy and L. Neyrand, rev. and corr., 3 vols., SC 31 [Paris, 2003] = GCS): τῶν δὲ ἱερῶν τοῦ σωτήρος ἡμῶν ἀποστόλων τε καὶ μαθητῶν ἐφ’ ἅπασαν κατασπαρέντων τὴν οἰκουμένην, Θωμᾶς μὲν, ὡς ἡ παράδοσις περιέχει, τὴν Παρθίαν εἰληγεν, Ἀνδρέας δὲ τὴν Σκυθίαν, Ἰωάννης τὴν Ἀσίαν, πρὸς οὓς καὶ διατρίψας ἐν Ἐφέσῳ τελευτᾷ, Πέτρος δ’ ἐν Πόντῳ καὶ Γαλατίᾳ καὶ Βιθυνίᾳ Καππαδοκίᾳ τε καὶ Ἀσίᾳ κεκηρυχέναι τοῖς [ἐκ] διασπορᾶς Ἰουδαίοις ἔοικεν· ὅς καὶ ἐπὶ τέλει ἐν Ῥώμῃ γενόμενος, ἀνεσκολοπίσθη κατὰ κεφαλῆς, οὕτως αὐτὸς ἀξιώσας παθεῖν. τί δεῖ περὶ Παύλου λέγειν, ἀπὸ Ἱερουσαλὴμ μέχρι τοῦ Ἰλλυρικοῦ πεπληρωκότος τὸ εὐαγγέλιον τοῦ Χριστοῦ καὶ ὕστερον ἐν τῇ Ῥώμῃ ἐπὶ Νέρωνος μεμαρτυρηκότος; ταῦτα Σιργιένη κατὰ λέξιν ἐν τρίτῳ τόμῳ τῶν εἰς τὴν Γένεσιν ἐξηγητικῶν εἰρηται.

60 On this passage, and especially its claim of Origen’s imprimatur, see E. Junod, “Origène, Eusèbe et la tradition sur la répartition des champs de mission des apôtres (Eusèbe, *Histoire ecclésiastique*, III, 1, 1–3),” in *Les Actes apocryphes des apôtres: Christianisme et monde païen*, ed. F. Bovon (Geneva, 1981), 233–48. See also J.-D. Kaestli, “Les scènes inventoriées d’attribution des champs de mission et de départ de l’apôtre dans les actes apocryphes,” in *ibid.*, 249–64.

61 The precise relationship between “Judas Thomas” (*Acts of Thomas* 1; John 14:22 Syr^{cur}), “Thomas Didymus” (John 11:16, etc.), “Thaddeus/Thaddai/Addai” (Mark 3:18, Matt. 10:3), and “Judas (son/brother) of James” (Luke 6:16, Acts 1:13; cf. John 14:22 Gr/Syr^{sin}, Jude 1) is a complex one. I attempted to deal with this question elsewhere in a brief footnote (Johnson, “Reviving the Memory of the Apostles” [n. 18 above], 16 n. 62) but have since realized that the issue requires a more sustained treatment. For a sense of its complexity, see the study of J. R. Harris, *The Twelve Apostles* (Cambridge, 1927). Harris reached a conclusion similar to my own: that there was a harmonization between Thomas, Thaddeus, and Judas of James early in eastern (particularly Edessene) Christianity, resulting in the two figures appearing interchangeably in later Syriac texts. The “twin” motif seems to have been integral to a harmonization that could potentially extend back to the New Testament itself but is certainly present in the surviving Thomasine apocrypha from the second century (*Gospel of Thomas*, *Book of Thomas the Contender*, *Infancy Gospel of Thomas*). See also J. J. Gunther, “The Meaning and Origin of the Name ‘Judas Thomas,’” *Le Muséon* 93 (1980): 113–48, who argues that the name “Thomas” was associated with Encratism [*sic*], whereas non-encratic Christians favored the name Thaddeus. Thus,

given Egeria’s apparent ignorance of Thomas’s mission to India later in the fourth century, could it be posited that the India tradition was contested (or suppressed) in some circles of fourth-century Edessa?⁶² The later Syriac Addai (Thaddeus/Thaddai) and Mari traditions, which focus on Edessa and Sasanian Persia, respectively, could be further evidence of such a controversy, though, admittedly, those texts have almost nothing to say about Thomas himself.⁶³ One provisional explanation for the disappearance of the India tradition from

for Gunther, the name “Judas Thomas” — “Judas” being an early substitute for Thaddeus (e.g., Luke 6:16)—should be read as a hybrid of indigenous Edessene Christianity and local encratic traditions (138). But neither Harris nor Gunther attempted to explain the geographical significance of Thomas in India vis-à-vis Thomas in Edessa, particularly the question most pertinent to the present article: why various ancient writers might know one geographical tradition and not the other. For a summary of widely varying ancient accounts of Thomas’s travels, see T. Schermann, *Propheten- und Apostellegenden nebst Jüngerkatalogen des Dorotheus und verwandter Texte*, TU 31 (Leipzig, 1907), 272–76.

62 However, Ephrem knows the name “Judas Thomas” (*De fide*, ed. E. Beck, 2 vols., CSCO 154–55, *Scriptores Syri* 73–74 [Louvain, 1955], text 73:35, trans. 74:25) and that Thomas was a missionary to India (*Hymni dispersi* 5.14, 6.3, 7.1, in *Hymni et sermones*, ed. T. J. Lamy, 4 vols. [Mehlin, 1902], 4.693–708). The India tradition is also known to Jerome, Ambrose, Gregory of Nazianzus, and the *Manichaean Psalm Book* (see references in Klijn, *Acts of Thomas* [n. 57 above], 18–19). It is also worth noting that three sermons on Thomas in India by Jacob of Serugh have survived: see W. Strothmann, *Jakob von Serug: Drei Gedichte über den Apostel Thomas in Indien* (Wiesbaden, 1976); A. Baumstark, *Geschichte der syrischen Literatur: Mit Ausschluss der christlich-palästinensischen Texte* (Bonn, 1922), 150–51. Interestingly, Edessa (Syr. *Urhai*) does seem to not appear in any of these sermons (Strothmann, “Verzeichnis der Eigennamen,” in *Drei Gedichte*, s.v.). Rather, the image of Thomas as carpenter and palace builder in the *Acts of Thomas* seems to have been of primary interest for Jacob, as well as for medieval Latin writers on Thomas: see A. Hilhorst, “The Heavenly Palace in the *Acts of Thomas*,” in *The Apocryphal Acts of Thomas*, ed. J. N. Bremmer (Louvain, 2001), 53–64; cf. Ephrem, *Hymni dispersi* 7 (ed. Lamy 4.705–8).

63 Importantly, the 5th-century *Doctrina Addai* shows familiarity with the image of Christ tradition discussed above: see Johnson, “Reviving the Memory of the Apostles,” 21–26. For a view doubting the existence of an early Syriac tradition of the image of Christ, see H. J. W. Drijvers, “The Image of Edessa in the Syriac Tradition,” in Kessler and Wolf, *Holy Face* (n. 20 above), 13–31. The multilayered composition of the *Doctrina Addai* offers particular challenges. The original appears to date from the time of Rabbula’s bishopric in Edessa (430s): see S. Griffith, “The *Doctrina Addai* as a Paradigm of Christian Thought in Edessa in the Fifth Century,” *Hugoye: Journal of Syriac Studies* 6.2 (2003), at <http://syrcom.cua.edu/hugoye/Vol6No2/HV6N2Griffith.html> (accessed November 2010). I am grateful to Jan Willem Drijvers for guidance on this topic.

fourth-century Edessa is that the Manichaeans, around the same time, had appropriated the *Acts of Thomas* as one of their scriptures and, further, considered India to be a religious battleground, where the foe initially was Buddhism and later Syriac Christianity.⁶⁴

The other apostles mentioned by Eusebius are Andrew in Scythia, John in Asia (particularly Ephesus), and Peter and Paul throughout the Mediterranean, ending up of course in Rome. This list constitutes a very small portion of the apostolic map but offers a firm foundation of associations known throughout the late antique Christian world. István Czachesz has recently published an illuminating study of specific commissions of apostles to specific regions, comparing the commissions via their literary morphology.⁶⁵ This survey includes John's call to Ephesus and Miletus (chap. 4); Thomas's call and refusal to go to India (chap. 5); Philip's call, in the fourth-century *Acts of Philip* (chap. 6), to numerous places, including Samaria, Athens, and Asia Minor (specifically, "the city of serpents," Ophreymos, sometimes identified with Hierapolis in Phrygia); the call of Barnabas and John Mark to Cyprus (Acts 16:37–39) in the fifth-century *Acts of Barnabas* (chap. 8); and, finally, the call of Titus to Crete in the fifth- to seventh-century *Acts of Titus* (chap. 9). The use of John Mark in the *Acts of Barnabas* is particularly interesting, because it seems to strengthen Barnabas's claim on Cyprus: the work is ostensibly written by John Mark himself, who gives an eyewitness description of Barnabas's martyrdom and claims to have been the one to bury the martyr's ashes.⁶⁶ In terms of literary typologies, both John Mark and Titus are explicitly devoted to Greek learning and gods prior to their conversions and commissions: Titus, in fact, is said to be from the lineage of King Minos and a devoted student of Homer.⁶⁷

In addition to examining specific callings, Czachesz also briefly deals with the type of scene we saw above in the *Acts of Thomas* and Eusebius book 3: that

of the distribution of the world to various apostles all in one sitting. As noted, this scene is common in the later Apocryphal Acts and appears in numerous variations, but in Greek always with the word κλήρος, "lot" or "inheritance." Czachesz calls this the *sortes apostolorum* and connects the *sortes* to the religious opening of sacred books—that is, "bibliomancy"—citing as a parallel Augustine's *tolle lege* scene from the garden in Milan.⁶⁸ This *sortes apostolorum* motif is a phenomenon distinct from the better known, and often condemned, *sortes sanctorum* or *sortes biblicae*—the random opening of sacred books for divine inspiration (Isid. *Etym.* 8.9.28, s.v. "sortilegus").⁶⁹ My main interest here is in the *geographical* associations of the *sortes* tradition, though I recognize the connections between numerous types of divination, as will become clear below.

A crucial link between the geographical *sortes apostolorum* tradition and the broader *sortilegium* evidence among Christians is the scene from the first chapter of the canonical Acts in which the apostles cast lots to replace Judas in their company: "And they put forward two, Joseph called Barsabbas, who was surnamed Justus, and Matthias. And they prayed and said, 'Lord, who knowest the hearts of all men, show which one of these two thou hast chosen to take the place in this ministry and apostleship from which Judas turned aside, to go to his own place.' And they cast lots for them, and the lot fell on Matthias; and he was enrolled with the eleven apostles."⁷⁰ Interestingly,

68 Ibid., 220.

69 See the wealth of information in W. E. Klingshirn, "Defining the *Sortes Sanctorum*," Gibbon, Du Cange, and Early Christian Lot Divination," *JEChrSt* 10 (2002): 77–130. But Klingshirn does not investigate the geographical implications of the κλήρος/*sortes* tradition (cf. 112 on Joshua), concentrating instead on its mantic qualities and their reception in the Middle Ages. See also the rich material, including the *sortes Virgilianae*, collected in P. W. van der Horst, "Sortes: Sacred Books as Instant Oracles in Late Antiquity," in *Japheth in the Tents of Shem: Studies on Jewish Hellenism in Antiquity* (Louvain, 2002), 159–89. Van der Horst links the rise in canonical thinking about the Hebrew Bible in the Hellenistic period to the emergence of bibliomancy among Jews (160–61), but the Hebrew Bible examples that I cite below could have easily provided an imprimatur for early Christian thinking on this issue. In other words, one need not prove continuous practice from ancient to Hellenistic Jews to arrive at Christian lot-casting (cf. Van der Horst's analysis of the two Maccabean examples in "Ancient Jewish Bibliomancy," *Journal of Greco-Roman Christianity and Judaism* 1 [2000]: 10–17).

70 Acts 1:23–26 (trans. RSV; ed. NA27): Καὶ ἔστησαν δύο, Ἰωσήφ τὸν καλούμενον Βαρσαββᾶν ὃς ἐπεκλήθη Ἰούστος, καὶ Μαθθαῖον. καὶ

64 I owe this suggestion to personal correspondence with Stephen Shoemaker. See S. N. C. Lieu, *Manichaeism in the Later Roman Empire and Medieval China*, 2nd ed. (Tübingen, 1992), 75, 87; and P.-H. Poirier, "Les *Acts de Thomas* et le manichéisme," *Apocrypha* 9 (1998): 263–87. See further note 103 below.

65 I. Czachesz, *Commission Narratives: A Comparative Study of the Canonical and Apocryphal Acts* (Louvain, 2007).

66 Ibid., 194–203.

67 Ibid., 208.

while Matthias is chosen by lot (κλήρος), the apostles nevertheless pray that God would demonstrate through the lot who his preference is.⁷¹ There is no mention of Jesus, though one commentator claims that the papyri point to Matthias's being chosen by Jesus in the original version of Acts.⁷² Note especially the physical casting of lots to make a divinely inspired choice, which brings to mind a prominent Old Testament precursor in the Urim and Thummim. These were tools of divination used by the high priest in association with a special ephod and breastplate to give guidance to Israel's leaders.⁷³

Consider the scene from 1 Samuel in which Saul uses the Urim and Thummim. Here, we are firmly in the world of divine forecasting: "Therefore Saul said, 'O LORD God of Israel, why hast thou not answered thy servant this day? If this guilt is in me or in Jonathan my son, O LORD, God of Israel, give Urim; but if this guilt is in thy people Israel, give Thummim.' And Jonathan and Saul were taken, but the people escaped. Then Saul said, 'Cast the lot between me and my son Jonathan.' And Jonathan was taken."⁷⁴ Here also the

lot casting is for a person, and in particular a divinely chosen person. Importantly, the Saul and Jonathan story manifests broader literary resonances that need to be investigated: namely, the inheritance of the kingdom and of the land, a theme developed via earlier Old Testament stories, such as the dividing up of the land of Canaan among the twelve tribes in Joshua: "And you shall describe the land in seven divisions and bring the description here to me; and I will cast lots for you here before the Lord our God."⁷⁵ This passage occurs in the midst of a number of uses of the common word גִּזְלָה, "inheritance," though that is not the word here for "lot," גִּזְלָה.⁷⁶ Scholars have explained the intrusion of גִּזְלָה (with the conjectural etymology of "pebble" or "stone") in a number of ways, some of them relying on the resonances with Urim and Thummim and others considering the pattern of Sumerian inheritance texts, which also depict lot casting.⁷⁷ The latter association seems to be very promising indeed, though it is clear that there is also a strong internal Hebrew tradition of

προσευξάμενοι εἶπαν· σὺ κύριε καρδιογνώστα πάντων, ἀνάδειξον ὃν ἐξελέξω ἐκ τούτων τῶν δύο ἵνα λαβείν τὸν τόπον τῆς διακονίας ταύτης καὶ ἀποστολῆς ἀφ' ἧς παρέβη Ἰούδας πορευθῆναι εἰς τὸν τόπον τὸν ἴδιον. καὶ ἔδωκαν κλήρους αὐτοῖς καὶ ἔπεσεν ὁ κλήρος ἐπὶ Μαθθίαν καὶ συγκατεψηφίσθη μετὰ τῶν ἑνδεκα ἀποστόλων.

71 One might not want to separate this mantic trajectory of lot casting from other usages of κλήρος in the Bible, such as in the casting of lots for Jesus's clothes, a scene that appears in all four Gospels (Matt. 27:35 = Mark 15:24 = Luke 23:34 = John 19:24; only John makes explicit the allusion to LXX Psalm 22:18). Later writers also seem to make the connection, as does Gregory of Tours, when a silk garment that once wrapped the true cross is divided and apportioned to different individuals in need of healing (*De gloria martyrum* 5, in *Gregorii Turonensis Opera*, ed. W. Arndt and B. Krusch, MGH, *Scriptores rerum Merovingicarum*, 2 vols. [Hannover, 1884–85], 491–92). However, when he comes to the actual tunic of Christ (7; ed. Arndt and Krusch, 492–93), Gregory says it resides in a wooden box in a city called Galatea, where it is "assiduously adored" though presumably remains undivided (trans. R. Van Dam, *Gregory of Tours: Glory of the Martyrs* [Liverpool, 1988], 26–28, at 28).

72 W. A. Beardslee, "The Casting of Lots at Qumran and in the Book of Acts," *Novum Testamentum* 4 (1960): 245–52.

73 Note that the precise usage of these implements remains a mystery to biblical scholars: "The words Urim and Thummim have received no satisfactory etymology, and the technique whereby guidance was made plain has not been recorded" (*The Anchor Bible Dictionary*, ed. D. N. Freedman [New York, 1992], s.v. "Urim and Thummim").

74 1 Sam. 14:41–42 (trans. RSV; ed. BHS):

וַיֹּאמֶר שָׁאוּל אֶל־יְהוָה אֱלֹהֵי יִשְׂרָאֵל הֲבָה תָמִים וְיִלְכָּד יוֹנָתָן וְשָׁאוּל וְהָעָם יִצְאוּ:
וַיֹּאמֶר שָׁאוּל הֲפִלּוּ בַיָּיִ וּבִי וּבִן יוֹנָתָן בְּגִי וְיִלְכָּד יוֹנָתָן:

On this passage, defective in the Masoretic text, see J. Lindblom, "Lot-Casting in the Old Testament," *Vetus Testamentum* 12 (1962): 164–78. Note also the LXX additions to this passage: καὶ εἶπεν Σαουλ Κύριε ὁ θεὸς Ἰσραὴλ, τί ὅτι οὐκ ἀπεκρίθης τῷ δούλῳ σου σήμερον; εἰ ἐν ἐμοὶ ἢ ἐν Ἰωνᾶθαν τῷ υἱῷ μου ἢ ἀδικία, κύριε ὁ θεὸς Ἰσραὴλ, δὸς δῆλους, καὶ ἐὰν τάδε εἴπῃς· Ἐν τῷ λαῷ σου Ἰσραὴλ, δὸς δὴ ὁσιότητα. καὶ κληροῦται Ἰωνᾶθαν καὶ Σαουλ, καὶ ὁ λαὸς ἐξῆλθεν. καὶ εἶπεν Σαουλ Βάλετε ἀνὰ μέσον ἐμοῦ καὶ ἀνὰ μέσον Ἰωνᾶθαν τοῦ υἱοῦ μου, ὃν ἂν κατακληρώσῃται κύριος, ἀποθανέτω. καὶ εἶπεν ὁ λαὸς πρὸς Σαουλ Οὐκ ἔστιν τὸ ῥῆμα τοῦτο. καὶ κατεκράτησεν Σαουλ τοῦ λαοῦ, καὶ βάλλουσιν ἀνὰ μέσον αὐτοῦ καὶ ἀνὰ μέσον Ἰωνᾶθαν τοῦ υἱοῦ αὐτοῦ, καὶ κατακληροῦται Ἰωνᾶθαν (A. Rahlfs and R. Hanhart, eds., *Septuaginta: Id est Vetus Testamentum Graece iuxta LXX Interpretes*, 2nd ed. [Stuttgart, 2006]).

75 Josh. 18:6 (trans. RSV; ed. BHS):

וְאַתֶּם תַּכְתְּבוּ אֶת־הָאָרֶץ שְׁבַעַה חֲלָקִים וְהִבְאַתֶּם אֵלַי הֵנָּה וְהִי־יִי לָכֶם גִּזְלָה פֶּה לַפָּנִי יְהוָה אֱלֹהֵינוּ

76 For examples from the Psalms, see Czachesz, *Commission Narratives* (n. 65 above), 229 n. 22.

77 A. M. Kitz, "Undivided Inheritance and Lot Casting in the Book of Joshua," *JBL* 119 (2000): 601–18. Note that in the LXX version the word κλήρος is used and not ψῆφος, which may have some bearing on the conjectural etymology in Hebrew: ὑμεῖς δὲ μερίσατε τὴν γῆν ἐπτά μερίδας καὶ ἐνέγκατε πρὸς με ὧδε, καὶ ἐξοίσω ὑμῖν κλήρον ἐναντὶ κυρίου τοῦ θεοῦ ἡμῶν (ed. Rahlfs).

the casting of lots, especially in connection with the division of property through inheritance.⁷⁸

Moving further back into this tradition, we begin to see patterns of speech formulated and repeated, such as in a related passage in Numbers 36:55–56: “But the land shall be divided by lot (לְגִזְרָה); according to the names of the tribes of their fathers they shall inherit. Their inheritance (נַחֲלָה) shall be divided according to lot (לְגִזְרָה) between the larger and the smaller.”⁷⁹ The Septuagint version of this passage contains an important instance of the abstract noun κληρονομία, demonstrating the long-lasting close association, into Hellenistic Greek, between strict “inheritance” (κληρονομία) and “lot” (κληρος), a relationship expressed here by נַחֲלָה and לְגִזְרָה, respectively.⁸⁰ Of course, κληρονομία in the New Testament has lofty metaphorical connotations, standing in for the transcendent salvation offered to God’s people through Jesus (e.g., Galatians 3:18; cf. κληρος at Acts 26:18 and Colossians 1:12).

Importantly, κληρος in the Septuagint translates a host of Hebrew words, including the word מוֹרֶשֶׁת, “possession,” as in Exodus 6:8: “And I will bring you into the land which I swore to give to Abraham, to Isaac, and to Jacob; I will give it to you for a possession (מוֹרֶשֶׁת). I am the LORD.”⁸¹ The phrase in the Septuagint for “for a possession” is ἐν κλήρῳ, demonstrating further the breadth of this word in Greek. Thus κληρος can translate the Hebrew words לְגִזְרָה, “pebble” or “lot”; נַחֲלָה, “inheritance”; and מוֹרֶשֶׁת, “possession.” This versatile word κληρος has, in fact, an influence on English, being at least part of the source of the word “clergy,” according to the *Oxford English Dictionary*

(s.v. “clergy,” I.4). This sense seems to have entered the language via 1 Peter 5:3—“not as domineering over those in your charge (τῶν κλήρων) but being examples to the flock”—and the Levitical κληρος mentioned in Deuteronomy 18:2 and Joshua 21 (both are equivalent to לְגִזְרָה; cf. 1 Chronicles 24–25). This usage is instantiated in the *Justinianic Code* relating to the clergy (ἐν κλήρῳ καταλεγόμενος, “one reckoned among the clergy,” *CI* 1.3.38.2; cf. *CIC Nov* 6.1.7).

To return to classical Greek literature for a moment, the theme of *sortes* has general sanction from *Iliad* 4, in which the gods assign portions of the world to one another. This theme finds a more specific expression in book 15, when Poseidon describes the lots assigned to the three sons of Kronos: himself, Zeus, and Hades. Here, there is no casting of lots but a discussion of lot (explicitly κληρος) as family inheritance.⁸² The casting of lots also occurs in book 7 when the Greeks are choosing who will fight Hector in the absence of Achilles. The word κληρος is used several times, both specifically—the mark they each throw into Agamemnon’s helmet—and metaphorically when Ajax is gladdened by his “lot” (e.g., 7.171, 175, 181, 191).⁸³ On the historical side, the use of lots plays a significant role in land inheritance law at Sparta; and when Aristotle in his *Politics* criticizes Sparta’s system, he singles out the role of the κληρόνομος, “the heir,” who is responsible for distributing an estate in the absence of a will.⁸⁴ The anthropologist Michael Herzfeld has shown how the casting of lots has persisted in many Greek villages as a means of settling inheritance disputes among brothers.⁸⁵ He concludes that while often frustrating to the brother who draws the lowest lot, the process is an accepted form of easing social tension and prevents larger disputes from occurring.⁸⁶ Sometimes these lots are cast even before the death of the parents in order to (try to) ensure an equitable and respected outcome. In his words, “The casting of lots [in Greece] is commonly

78 Lindblom, “Lot-Casting in the Old Testament,” passim.

79 Num. 26:55–56 (trans. RSV; ed. BHS):

אֶת־בְּגִזְרָה יִחַלֵּק אֶת־הָאָרֶץ לְשִׁמּוֹת מְשׁוֹת־אֲבֹתָם יִנְחִלּוּ:
עַל־פִּי הַגִּזְרָה תִּחַלֵּק נַחֲלָתוֹ בֵּין רֵב לְמַעַט:

LXX (ed. Rahlfs): διὰ κλήρων μερισθήσεται ἡ γῆ, τοῖς ὀνόμασιν κατὰ φυλὰς πατριῶν αὐτῶν κληρονομήσουσιν, ἐκ τοῦ κλήρου μεριεῖς τὴν κληρονομίαν αὐτῶν ἀνὰ μέσον πολλῶν καὶ ὀλίγων.

80 See also κληρος for לְגִזְרָה in Ps. 16:5 (“The LORD is my chosen portion and my cup; thou holdest my lot,” trans. RSV).

81 Exod. 6:8 (trans. RSV; ed. BHS):

וְהִבְאַתִּי אֲתָכֶם אֶל־הָאָרֶץ אֲשֶׁר נִשְׁאַתִּי אֶת־יְדֵי לְתֵת אֶתָּה
לְאַבְרָהָם לְיִצְחָק וְלַיַּעֲקֹב וְנָתַתִּי אֶתָּה לְכָם מוֹרֶשֶׁת אֲנִי יְהוָה:

LXX (ed. Rahlfs): καὶ εἰσάξω ὑμᾶς εἰς τὴν γῆν, εἰς ἣν ἐξέτεινα τὴν χεῖρά μου δοῦναι αὐτὴν τῷ Ἀβραάμ καὶ Ἰσαὰκ καὶ Ἰακώβ, καὶ δώσω ὑμῖν αὐτὴν ἐν κλήρῳ, ἐγὼ κύριος.

82 M. L. West, *The East Face of Helicon: West Asiatic Elements in Greek Poetry and Myth* (Oxford, 1997), 109–11.

83 P. Demont, “Lots héroïques: Remarques sur la tirage au sort de l’*Iliade* aux Sept Contre Thebes d’Eschyle,” *REG* 113 (2000): 299–325.

84 Aristotle, *Politics* 1270a15–1270b6; S. Hodkinson, “Land Tenure and Inheritance in Classical Sparta,” *CQ*, n.s. 36 (1986): 387.

85 M. Herzfeld, “Social Tension and Inheritance by Lot in Three Greek Villages,” *Anthropological Quarterly* 53 (1980): 91–100.

86 Ibid., 97–98.

explained by villagers as a way of placing the responsibility for a difficult decision on the shoulders of Fate.”⁸⁷

So, when we consider this broad tradition of apportioning the land through the casting of lots—a tradition firmly rooted in biblical texts, Hebrew as well as Greek, both in the Old Testament and the New (and with ancient Mesopotamian and classical Greek resonance to boot)—it is perhaps unsurprising that late antique Apocryphal Acts (from the *Acts of Thomas* through the eighth century) make use of this device. The casting of lots among the twelve apostles in Acts 1 seems to be one bridge between the twelve tribes of Israel and the late antique Christian use of the motif.⁸⁸ Both groups cast lots (κλήρους) for their respective spheres of influence: for instance, in the Coptic *Preaching of Philip*, Jesus explicitly commands the apostles, “Now cast lots among each other, and divide the world into twelve parts.”⁸⁹ In the third-century Syriac *Didascalia apostolorum* the apostles divide (فلا) the world into twelve parts, though there is no mention of casting lots.⁹⁰ In several Greek texts, the verb λαγχάνω is used, sometimes in combination with κληρος: thus, the lot can “fall” to apostles, usually with Jesus’s intervention but without the casting of lots by the apostles themselves.⁹¹ Strikingly, the Syriac *Acts of Thomas* combines all of this terminology, using فلا, “to divide,” to describe the entire process, while also incorporating lot-casting language by using the verb حلا, “to come to, to fall,” combined with the noun فصال, “lot,” to describe Thomas’s commission to India.⁹² Czachesz claims that Jesus’s specific commissioning of the apostles is the more original form of the motif, with the casting of lots by the apostles being a later (firmly late antique) addition.⁹³ If true, this is an important shift toward apostles and saints claiming local regions for their own work, much as Thekla did in Seleukeia (in the *Life and Miracles*), or as Antony did in the Egyptian

desert, or stylite saints such as Daniel began to do in the fifth century.



What this article argues, however, is not simply that this motif is part of a literary morphology (as in Czachesz’s argument), as important as that is. Rather, in a cognitive or organizational sense, the geographical sortes apostolorum undergirds early Christian thought about the order of the earth, and, consequently, the inheritance of the apostles as a literary theme becomes for various late antique and medieval writers a modus operandi for discussing the spheres of influence of contemporary cult sites, with or without relics.⁹⁴ A key text for comparison is John Moschus’s *Spiritual Meadow* from around 600 CE. This work comes at the end of the major hagiographical developments in late antiquity and inhabits a clearly post-Chalcedonian world, fractured between neo-Chalcedonians, Miaphysites (derogatively labeled “Severans”), and the Church of the East (derogatively labeled “Nestorians”). But in some ways, the fracturing is less apparent in Moschus than in exegetical or historical texts: the uniting Greco-Roman oikoumene, in the form of a largely free Mediterranean, is still in existence, even if on the brink of the Persian and Arab conquests of the early seventh century. The *Spiritual Meadow* is a travel text, yet one that does not follow a directional narrative in the vein of pilgrimage accounts. Moschus and his companion Sophronius the Sophist (probably Sophronius the Patriarch of Jerusalem, ca. 560–638) collected stories of the miraculous affairs of monks in a number of monastic centers around the eastern Mediterranean: from the Thebaïd in Egypt, Mount Sinai, the Judean desert, the Antiochene hinterland, Cilicia in southern Asia Minor, Alexandria, and finally ending up in Rome (or Constantinople, as some have argued).⁹⁵ After Moschus’s death in Rome

87 Ibid., 98.

88 On this question of continuity between Jewish and early Christian texts, see Beardslee, “Casting of Lots” (n. 72 above), 245–52.

89 Czachesz, *Commission Narratives*, 227.

90 Ibid., 228 n. 18.

91 In Acts 1:26 the verb is πιπτω.

92 See note 58 above for the text.

93 Czachesz, *Commission Narratives*, 230–31.

94 For the western medieval association of the sortes apostolorum and cartography, see C. Van Duzer and I. Dines, “The Only *Mappamundi* in a Bestiary Context: Cambridge, MS Fitzwilliam 254,” *Imago Mundi* 58 (2006): 7–22.

95 On Moschus and Sophronius, see H. Chadwick, “John Moschus and His Friend Sophronius the Sophist,” *JTS*, n.s. 25 (1974): 41–74; A. Louth, “Did John Moschos Really Die in Constantinople?” *JTS*, n.s. 49 (1998): 149–54. On Judean monasticism in this period, see J. Binns, *Ascetics and Ambassadors of Christ: The Monasteries of Palestine, 314–631* (Oxford, 1994), and B.

in either 619 or 634, Sophronius brought his body back east, burying him in the monastery of St. Theodosios near Bethlehem.

This is a tale well known among scholars of saints' Lives. Yet the stories—more than two hundred of them from all over the eastern Mediterranean—have no thematic development and are not laid out in any discernible geographical order. For the most part, they do not follow the movements of Moschus and Sophronius through the real-world landscapes of holy men. Despite this absence of explicit geographical orientation, individual stories establish in identifiable patterns the ownership of specific landscapes belonging to specific holy monks. They assume a geographical framework (like the itinerarium), but one that is not directly linked to the literary organization of the material (unlike the itinerarium). For instance, scattered stories throughout the collection involve the use of caves (sometimes former lions' dens; e.g., 13), and in one story (29) rival Chalcedonian and Miaphysite stylite saints vie with one another "six miles apart." A number of other episodes of a geographical or topographical nature could be adduced here.

This type of geography is metaphorical and experiential, and it rests on a number of assumptions. One such assumption is that some monks are called to a locale all their own. Thus, in the first story of the collection, John the Elder, a monk in Jerusalem, desires to pray on Sinai, but before they have reached the first milepost beyond the Jordan, he is afflicted with a fever.⁹⁶ When he takes refuge in a cave, John the Baptist appears to him and promises to remove the fever if John the Elder will take up permanent residence in that cave: "For this little cave is greater than Mount Sinai. Many times did our Lord Jesus Christ come here to visit me. Give me your word that you will stay here and I will give you back your health" (1). John the Elder assents and is immediately restored to health. Moschus tells us that he remained in the cave till his death and closes the story by noting that John the Elder made the cave into a church and gathered a group of monks there. The place,

Bitton-Ashkelony and A. Kofsky, "Monasticism in the Holy Land," in *Christians and Christianity in the Holy Land: From the Origins to the Latin Kingdoms*, ed. O. Limor and G. Stroumsa (Turnhout, 2006), 257–91.

96 See the translation in J. Wortley, *John Moschus: The Spiritual Meadow* (Kalamazoo, 1992). Wortley's translation is made from the Migne text, PG 87c: 2852–3112.

called Sapsas in the text, was also known as the Wadi Chorath (the brook Cherith), east of the Jordan near Jericho—precisely where Elijah the Tishbite was sent during a drought (1 Kings 17:1–5).⁹⁷

We see a number of important geographical assumptions and arguments here, beginning with the argument that Sinai is a lesser holy site than this cave. The reason for the cave's preeminence is not explicitly given, but John the Baptist's appearance and speech there seem to assume that the presence of renowned holy people, John the Baptist himself and Jesus too, lend it the value it has. Note that the argument is not "This is a mere cave, and you should be satisfied with it." Rather, the association of individuals, including (at the very end) one of the most prominent Old Testament prophets, Elijah, is the underlying motivation.⁹⁸ The visits of Jesus to John the Baptist's cave are apocryphal—the Gospels contain no mention of the two personally meeting beyond Jesus's baptism in the Jordan (e.g., Matthew 3). Nevertheless, in later memory the Jordan Valley seems to have been John the Baptist's own region—a location not far from Mount Tabor, on the west side of the Jordan, where, at least by the fourth century, it was thought that the transfiguration had occurred.⁹⁹ The transfiguration directly and visibly associated Jesus and Elijah

97 Wortley, *Spiritual Meadow*, 233: "a monastery was founded on this location when Elijah was patriarch of Jerusalem (494–516)"—a doubling of Elijahs, like Zechariah above (n. 54).

98 See the discussion concerning Old Testament prophets as models for Christian holy men in D. Satran, *Biblical Prophets in Byzantine Palestine: Reassessing the Lives of the Prophets* (Leiden, 1995), chap. 4; note esp. p. 103: "From his very inception, both historical and literary, the Byzantine saint had been portrayed as a true successor to the heroes of Scripture." I would only add here that "Scripture" certainly includes the apostles and other New Testament figures as well. See also D. Krueger, *Writing and Holiness: The Practice of Authorship in the Early Christian East* (Philadelphia, 2004), chaps. 2 (on Old Testament typology), 3 (on the evangelists as holy men).

99 ODB, s.v. "Tabor, Mount," where Cyril of Jerusalem in 348 "decisively" identified this site. Cf. Matt. 17:1–13 = Mark 9:2–13 = Luke 9:28–36. For a thorough discussion of the Hebraic background, see *Anchor Bible Dictionary*, s.v. "Tabor, Mount." Note that some scholars today favor the identification of Mount Hermon, in the north, as the site of the transfiguration scene: see *Anchor Bible Dictionary*, s.vv. "Hermon, Mount," "Transfiguration." Because of the juxtaposition of Tabor and Hermon in Ps. 89:12, some traditions have erroneously located them near one another or even misidentified one with the other.

(and Moses), and there may be here in Moschus some attempt to connect Elijah's New Testament appearance to the region associated with John the Baptist. If so, this would be a physical connection corresponding to the early Jewish-Christian link already signaled in the Gospels.¹⁰⁰ But such a connection is not absolutely necessary. It is already clear that in this story from the *Spiritual Meadow*, John the Elder connects the famous prophetic triumvirate (Elijah, Jesus, John the Baptist) to his own residence in the cave—retreating from the world to the Wadi Chorath, as the prophets Elijah and John did before him in the same region, yet establishing his own tradition: a “brotherhood” (ἀδελφότητα), as the text calls it, centered on the cave.

Other aspects of the *Spiritual Meadow* are also worth noting. As in Egeria, the holy men flock around sites and cities of historic importance to the Christian faith, particularly sites associated with an individual figure or multiple figures, be they apostles or Old Testament patriarchs. In Egeria a key scene of this type occurs between the visits to Edessa and Seleukeia mentioned above. Egeria visits Carrae/Haran, “a town full of pagans” as she says, but on the day she visits—which happens to be the feast day for the local saint “Helpidius” (probably not Elpidius of Cappadocia, d. fourth century)—innumerable holy men from the surrounding desert pour into the town to celebrate at his revered house, the place whence God called Abraham to go into Canaan (Genesis 12).¹⁰¹ The pattern is very similar in Moschus: these grizzled holy men are attracted from the countryside not primarily by the urbanity of the cities but rather by the conglomeration of biblical and apocryphal associations and the opportunity to celebrate the Eucharist on such a site. Their motivation is not terribly different from that of pilgrims or travelers, like Egeria and Moschus themselves. Tellingly, both of the latter writers find in these holy men kindred spirits, pursuing the kind of itinerant life they are trying to lead, and they make this kinship explicit in their texts. Yet there is a crucial difference: Egeria and Moschus are organizing and reorganizing this landscape through the very archiving of the stories and biblical associations they interact with. Their habit

is to link the texts, the sites, and the personalities in a believable manner and in a manner that corresponds to a preexistent geographical framework.

To be sure, we may perhaps assume that the described attitudes of the individuals, be they the bishop of Edessa or John the Elder, are imposed by the collector, in accordance with his or her worldview. It would be impossible to argue otherwise, given the level of redaction and authorial presence in these texts. Egeria and Moschus, however, claim to have learned about these local associations via the people and texts they interact with—the preeminent example for Egeria is Marthana, the superior of Thekla's shrine in Seleukeia, whom Egeria met first in Jerusalem. Moschus, too, repeatedly names individuals who enlightened him on specific monks and their marvelous deeds.



This article has not attempted to trace systematically every late antique notice related to the travels of the apostles. Instead, what I have argued is that these apocryphal travels are assumed beneath the surface of various kinds of hagiographical literature. It is habitual for late antique authors to think in terms of apostolic ownership of regions and to adopt, in effect, an “apostolic geography,” even in the manner in which they discuss more recent holy men and women. In fact, we have seen examples of late antique authors explaining the etiology of those regions through the direct appropriation, manipulation, and archiving of apostolic literature. We have also seen the continuity of such literary motifs as the geographical *sortes apostolorum* in new, late antique instantiations of that apostolic literature. To reiterate, Apocryphal Acta are not limited to the second century CE but continue to be written throughout late antiquity.¹⁰² They also account for a significant portion of the surviving Byzantine manuscripts, and they are translated into every early Christian language (Latin, Syriac, Coptic, Armenian, etc.) and remain popular within each separate tradition. The Manichaeans adopted a number of these works for themselves,¹⁰³ and—because

100 E.g., Mark 8:27–8: “‘Who do men say that I am?’ And they told him, ‘John the Baptist; and others say, Elijah; and others one of the prophets’” (RSV).

101 Egeria 20.1–13 (ed. Maraval).

102 As further evidence, see the study of Byzantine apocalyptic apocrypha by J. Baun, *Tales from Another Byzantium: Celestial Journey and Local Community in the Medieval Greek Apocrypha* (Cambridge, 2007).

103 Augustine knew a Manichaean corpus of Apostolic Acta,

of this adoption and because of the eastward movement of the Church of the East—several Apocryphal Acta have been identified, both in fragments and complete, along the Silk Road to China, surfacing in languages such as Sogdian.¹⁰⁴ Thus, the apostles maintain a crucial place in late antique tradition, both within and outside the empire.

When Constantine the Great chose a place for his mausoleum in his capital city of Constantinople, he decided to locate it inside a new building, which he declared would also be a church.¹⁰⁵ This building, often

identified with the Church of the Holy Apostles, has been much discussed by scholars, who have debated its date, layout, and orientation.¹⁰⁶ But one of the most perplexing aspects of the building is that Constantine intended to be buried in the midst of the twelve apostles. Eusebius reports in his *Life of Constantine*:

Such were the emperor's offerings with a view to making eternal the memory of the Lord's apostles. He was, however, pursuing the construction having also another purpose in mind, which escaped notice at first and only later became evident to everybody. For he reserved for himself that spot for such time as was appointed for his demise, providing in advance, in the surpassing eagerness of his faith, that after his death his body should share in the invocation of the apostles with a view to benefiting, even after his demise, from the prayers that were going to be offered here in honor of the apostles. For which reason he ordained that services should also be performed here, having set up an altar-table in the middle. Indeed, he erected here twelve coffins—as it were sacred statues—in honor and remembrance of the apostolic choir and placed in the middle of them his own sarcophagus, on either side of which stood six of the apostles'. Such, then, as I have said, was his purpose, conceived with a sober mind, as regards the place where, after his death, his body was to repose in decorous fashion.¹⁰⁷

which included the Acts of Peter, Andrew, Thomas, John, and Paul: see F. Dvornik, *The Idea of Apostolicity in Byzantium and the Legend of the Apostle Andrew* (Cambridge, MA, 1958), 189. The Manichaeans regarded this corpus as a replacement for the canonical Acts. On the attribution of the corpus to a "Leucius," see J. Flamion, *Les actes apocryphes de l'Apôtre André: Les actes d'André et de Mathias, de Pierre et d'André et les textes apparentés* (Louvain, 1911), 189–91, citing Aug. C. Fel. 2.6 (cf. *Decretum Gelasianum* 19).

104 The real history of Syriac missions to the East has received less attention than the legendary literature of Edessa. This history on the ground is attested by both literary and material remains. It includes missions to India and along the Silk Road as well as, remarkably, the arrival of Alopen, a Church of the East missionary, in Tang China (Xi'an) in 635 CE, a story enshrined in the "Nestorian Monument" of 781. For the history of the Church of the East generally, see W. Baum and D. W. Winkler, *The Church of the East: A Concise History*, trans. M. G. Henry (London, 2003), and C. Baumer, *The Church of the East: An Illustrated History of Assyrian Christianity* (London, 2006). On the Church of the East in China, see P. Pelliot, *L'inscription nestorienne de Si-Ngan-Fou*, ed. A. Forte (Kyoto, 1996); R. Malek, ed., *Jingjiao: The Church of the East in China and Central Asia* (Sankt Augustin, 2006); and Li Tang, *A Study of the History of Nestorian Christianity in China and Its Literature in Chinese: Together with a New English Translation of the Dunhuang Nestorian Documents* (Frankfurt am Main, 2002). On Sogdian Christian literature translated from Syriac, see N. Sims-Williams, *The Christian Sogdian Manuscript C2* (Berlin, 1985).

105 For background on this church, see C. Mango, "Constantine's Mausoleum and the Translation of Relics," *BZ* 83 (1990): 51–61, and idem, "Constantine's Mausoleum: Addendum," *BZ* 83 (1990): 434. Mango's interpretation is not universally accepted, and the *VC* passage quoted below has been seen by some scholars as an interpolation in the text. On these debates, see Av. Cameron and S. G. Hall, *Eusebius: Life of Constantine* (Oxford, 1999), 337–39. See also P. Grierson, "The Tombs and Obits of the Byzantine Emperors (337–1042); with an Additional Note by Cyril Mango and Ihor Ševčenko," *DOP* 16 (1962): 1–63. Grierson follows G. Downey ("The Builder of the Original Church of the Apostles at Constantinople," *DOP* 6 [1951]: 51–80) in attributing both the mausoleum and the church to Constantine II; on this attribution, see below. On imperial mausolea in late antiquity generally, see now M. J. Johnson, *The Roman Imperial Mausoleum in Late Antiquity* (Cambridge, 2009).

106 For a recent survey of the extant fabric of the building, see K. Dark and F. Özgümüş, "New Evidence for the Byzantine Church of the Holy Apostles from Fatih Camii, Istanbul," *Oxford Journal of Archaeology* 21 (2002): 393–413. Prof. Özgümüş has told me (personal correspondence) that a monolithic column, probably from the Holy Apostles complex, was recently discovered under the courtyard pavement of the Fatih Camii.

107 *VC* 4.58–60 (trans. Mango, "Constantine's Mausoleum and the Translation of Relics," 55; ed. F. Winkelmann, *Eusebius Werke*, 1.1, *Über das Leben des Kaisers Konstantin*, GCS 57 [Berlin, 1965], 144–45): Ταῦτα πάντα ἀφίερόν βασιλεὺς διαιωνίζων εἰς ἅπαντας τῶν τοῦ σωτῆρος ἡμῶν ἀποστόλων τὴν μνήμην. ὥκοδόμει δ' ἄρα καὶ ἄλλο τι τῇ διανοίᾳ σκοπῶν, ὃ δὲ λανθάνον τὰ πρῶτα κατάφωρον πρὸς τῷ τέλει τοῖς πᾶσιν ἐγίγνετο. αὐτὸς γοῦν αὐτῷ εἰς δέοντα καιρὸν τῆς αὐτοῦ τελευτῆς τὸν ἐνταυθοὶ τόπον ἐταμειύσατο, τῆς τῶν ἀποστόλων προσήσεως κοινωνὸν τὸ ἐαυτοῦ σκῆνος μετὰ θάνατον προνοῶν ὑπερβαλλούσῃ πίστει προθυμίᾳ γεγενῆσθαι,

What can we say about this grand, even blasphemous, vision? I believe that the image and theme of the geographical *sortes apostolorum* may have been on his mind: the first Christian emperor surrounding himself with the company of missionaries who extended God's kingdom to the outmost reaches of the empire and beyond.

Eusebius notes elsewhere that Constantine offhandedly described himself as "perhaps a bishop appointed by God over those outside" (*VC* 4.24, ed. Winkelmann).¹⁰⁸ To my knowledge this inscrutable statement has only once before been interpreted in a geographical sense, which is certainly a possibility if the mausoleum was meant to have geographical connotations.¹⁰⁹ The geographical interpretation may be more likely if Constantine had applied the label *apostle* instead of *bishop*, but the context of the comment is admittedly a dinner-table aside. The context of the mausoleum, by contrast, is much grander: later Byzantine writers invariably use the word ἡρώον to describe both it and Justinian's adjacent mausoleum.¹¹⁰ Could Constantine's architectural argument have been that he completed the evangelizing work of the apostles by unifying the oikoumene, as a kind of κληρόνομος, inheriting and uniting the various κληροί of the apostles—or, perhaps better, that the New Rome stood as the hub of a wheel with apostolic or missionary spokes extending outward to the furthest reaches of the unknown world? In later memory, Constantine's Byzantine epithet, *isapostolos* (equal to the apostles), certainly signals an abiding and fundamental relationship between the emperor and the twelve apostles.¹¹¹ Cyril Mango has suggested that following the tradition of Galerius's

arch at Thessalonike, Constantine was placing himself in the company of the "twelve gods" of Christianity.¹¹² I would prefer to see this unique structure with its accompanying θῆκαι/σπήλαι (tombs, sarcophagi; effigies, memorials) as no less a geographical than a religious or ideological statement. We may even go a step further to suggest that it was a Constantinopolitan statement: in this reading, Constantine was the apostle commissioned to found and adorn the Christian imperial city and, by doing so, he somehow completed the project the apostles had (in one interpretation) set out to achieve: that of "making disciples of all nations" (Matthew 28:18–20).¹¹³

The Holy Apostles complex is often seen (with hindsight) as a church designed to house apostolic relics. However, whether it was a life-size reliquary per se is a debated issue. A number of texts claim that the relics were added only later under Constantius II, precisely on 3 March 357. If true, it would seem that Constantine's vision did not include them. It has been suggested, on the basis of Eusebius's enigmatic language (σπήλαι), that carved effigies of the apostles were placed around Constantine, perhaps in the fashion of some of the contemporary busts found in the city.¹¹⁴ In this view, the presence of the apostles was primarily an aesthetic choice, with the putative ramifications already noted. The mausoleum and church were then officially separated when a new church building, adjacent to the mausoleum, was begun around 356. Once it was completed in 357, the relics were installed in the church and not the mausoleum, but the entire complex was thereafter casually referred to as "Holy Apostles." However, other important testimonials, some also dated to the fourth century, claim Constantine himself translated the relics to the mausoleum. The installation date given by these is 21/22 June 336. As Mango has noted, the precision of these two separate dates (June 336 and March 357) strongly suggests that there was a revisionist (perhaps Arian) redaction

ὡς ἂν καὶ μετὰ τελευτὴν ἀξιώτο τῶν ἐνταυθοὶ μελλουσῶν ἐπὶ τιμῇ τῶν ἀποστόλων συντελεῖσθαι εὐχῶν. διὸ καὶ ἐκκλησιάζειν ἐνταυθοὶ παρεκελεύετο, μέσον θυσιαστήριον πηξάμενος. δώδεκα δ' οὖν αὐτόθι θήκας ὡσανεὶ στήλας ἱερὰς ἐπὶ τιμῇ καὶ μνήμῃ τοῦ τῶν ἀποστόλων ἐγείρας χοροῦ, μέσσην ἐτίθει τὴν αὐτὸς αὐτοῦ λάρνακα, ἥς ἐκατέρωθεν τῶν ἀποστόλων ἀνὰ ἑξ διέκειντο. καὶ τοῦτο γοῦν, ὡς ἔφην, σάφρονι λογισμῷ, ἐνθα αὐτῷ τὸ σκῆνος τελευτήσαντι τὸν βίον εὐπρεπῶς μέλλοι διαναπαύεσθαι, ἐσκόπει.

108 See Cameron and Hall, *Eusebius: Life of Constantine*, 161, 320.

109 See G. Fowden, *Empire to Commonwealth: Consequences of Monotheism in Late Antiquity* (Princeton, NJ, 1993), 90–93.

110 Grierson, "Tombs and Obits," 6.

111 See S. N. C. Lieu, "Constantine in Legendary Literature," in *The Cambridge Companion to the Age of Constantine*, ed. N. Lenski (New York, 2006), 305–7. There are, of course, a host of other saints named *isapostolos* or *aequalis apostolis* in later literature, including Mary Magdalene, Thekla, and Constantine's mother, Helena.

112 Mango, "Constantine's Mausoleum and the Translation of Relics," 58–59.

113 Compare the postcolonial reading of Egeria in Jacobs, *Remains of the Jews* (n. 49 above), 122: "The cacophony of languages into which the Jerusalem liturgy is translated at Easter testifies not so much to a diversity of Christian identities as to a unity of Christian imperialism. All 'otherness' is absorbed and thus erased within a robust and totalizing Christian identity."

114 A. Grabar, *Sculptures byzantines de Constantinople (IVe–Xe siècle)* (Paris, 1963), planche 1.

of the historical record under the reign of Constantius II.¹¹⁵ This new history and new date offered Constantius II the glory of an act of translation that was originally accomplished by his father.¹¹⁶

Ultimately, whether the relics were collected under Constantine himself or under his son, the only true apostle ever interred in the new church was Andrew, with Timothy and Luke added for good measure.¹¹⁷ It appears that the main problem in obtaining more than just the relics of Andrew was that the other eleven apostles already had their approved final

resting places, a distinct difficulty solved only later by chopping up these primordial saints and translating their relics. This was only the first tentative step of that later, fifth-century boom.¹¹⁸ Andrew was thought to have died by martyrdom at Patras; Luke at this time was vaguely associated with Boeotia; and Timothy was said to have been the first bishop of Ephesus, though Ephesus already had a true apostle in John. Their backstories were vague enough to allow for adjustment or complete rewriting. The eleven other apostles, of course, lay buried elsewhere, not in Constantinople at all but throughout the empire and beyond its borders, at the ends of the earth. Thus, Constantine's mausoleum-church structure—apparently intended as a kind of archive of the apostles with him at its center—perhaps failed his vision in the end, if indeed he was a relic hunter. What we can say with more certainty is that its mere conception testifies to the pervasive nature of apostolic geography and the underlying habits of the Christian mind as they were rising to the surface at the beginning of late antiquity.

Georgetown University
and Dumbarton Oaks
1703 32nd Street, NW
Washington, D.C., 20007
sj348@georgetown.edu

115 On the surviving evidence for these two dates, see R. W. Burgess, "The *Passio S. Artemii*, Philostorgius, and the Dates of the Invention and Translations of the Relics of Sts. Andrew and Luke," *AB* 121 (2003): 5–36. Burgess argues against the claim of D. Woods ("The Date of the Translation of the Relics of SS. Luke and Andrew to Constantinople," *VChr* 45 [1991]: 286–92) that the date of translation was actually 3 March 360. Burgess claims that translations occurred in both 336 and 357 and he accepts the notion of a Constantinian reliquary. However, the statement that "Constantine no doubt intended to fill the rest of the reliquaries, one or two at a time, over the remainder of his lifetime" (29) is conjectural and assumes too much regarding Constantine's intentions. Explaining the absence of evidence for Constantine's relic hunting, Burgess remarks, "Constantine had evidently made little fuss over his translation and it had almost no impact on the written record at all" (34). He acknowledges that his reconstruction of Constantine's purpose is hypothetical (28 n. 85). See M. J. Johnson, *Roman Imperial Mausoleum* (n. 105 above), 119–29, for a balanced interpretation of the evidence.

116 Mango, "Constantine's Mausoleum: Addendum" (n. 105 above).

117 On Andrew as apostolic patron of Constantinople—an association that came to prominence only beginning ca. 600—see Dvornik, *Idea of Apostolicity in Byzantium* (n. 103 above). The significance of Andrew in particular is that he was the brother of Peter and the first disciple called by Jesus (John 1:40–41). As such, and because he brought Peter to Jesus, Constantinople could claim apostolic equality or even preeminence over Rome in the east–west debates regarding patriarchal primacy.

118 See P. R. L. Brown, *Cult of the Saints: Its Rise and Function in Latin Christianity* (Chicago, 1981), 90–91: "By the early fifth century, the strictly 'geographical' map of the availability of the holy, which had tied the *praesentia* of the saints to the accidents of place and local history, had come to be irreversibly modified by a web of new cult sites, established by the translation of relics, which reflected the dependence of communities scattered all over Italy, Gaul, Spain, and Africa on the enterprise and generosity of a remarkable generation of distant friends."